North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates Final Program Environmental Impact Report

North Park Errata

Project No. 380611
SCH No. 2013121076

For clarity, the September 2016 Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) includes ~~strikeout~~/underline to identify changes that were made to the document since the public review Draft PEIR dated May 31, 2016.

The City of San Diego has made additional corrections to the September 2016 Final PEIR that are shown on the attached pages in double strikeout/underline (~~strikeout~~/underline) format and are described in these errata. These changes include minor corrections to the PEIR, as detailed below. These corrections do not result in any new physical effects.

Corrections:

1) The Executive Summary was revised (Section S.1) to state the exact acreage of the North Park CPU area as 2,258 acres instead of approximately 2,300 acres.

2) Table S-1, Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts, was revised to clarify the impacts to historic resources resulting from the proposed North Park CPU could occur *where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, including the 30th Street commercial potential historic district*.

3) Table S-1, Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts, was revised to remove the discussion of the supplemental development regulations under mitigation measure HIST 6.7-1.

4) Section 2.2.1, North Park Community Plan Update Area was revised to state the exact acreage of the North Park CPU area as 2,258 acres instead of approximately 2,300 acres.

5) The Regulatory Framework chapter, Section 5.3.2.5 was corrected to refer to the City of San Diego instead of Carlsbad.

6) Section 6.1.1, Existing Conditions was revised to remove an incorrect reference from the 1986 Community Plan that the plan area covers 1,466 acres to state more broadly that the adopted North Park Community Plan (1986) covers the Greater North Park Community Plan area.

7) Section 6.7.4, Impact Analysis, was revised to clarify that the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would not increase residential development potential within the identified potential historic districts and, therefore, the amended Historical Resources Regulations are not required to mitigate potential impacts to potential historic districts.

8) Impact 6.7-1 was revised to clarify that impacts to historic resources would occur where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning.

9) Section 6.7.5, Significance of Impacts, was revised to clarify the impacts to historic and archaeological resources.

10) Section 6.7.7, Significance of Impacts after Mitigation, was revised to clarify that the proposed North Park CPU would not result in impacts to potential historic districts because it would not increase residential development in potential historic districts.

11) Table 6.12-2 and the text on page 6.12-12 were revised to provide minor acreage corrections and refinements (~0.15 acre) to the acreages of population-based parks and park equivalencies.

12) Section 11.1.2.a, Land Use, was revised to correct the wording of potential historic districts.

13) The following responses to comments were revised to clarify that the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would not increase residential development potential within the identified potential historic districts and, therefore, the proposed amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations (supplemental development regulations) are not required to mitigate potential impacts to potential historic districts:

    a. Comment Letter B3 (North Park Historical Society), response to comments B3-11 and B3-55.

    b. Comment Letter B4 (North Park Planning Committee), response to comments B4-6, B4-48, B4-51, B4-56, B4-58, and B4-61.

    c. Comment letter B8 (Save our Heritage Organisation), response to comments B8-2 and B8-4.

    d. Comment Letter C18 (Randi Vita), response to comment C18-4.

S

Executive Summary

S.1 Proposed Project

Project Location and Setting

The North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Update (CPU) areas are centrally located to the north and east of Downtown San Diego and south of the Mission Valley community. The North Park Community Plan area forms a portion of the northern and eastern boundaries of Balboa Park; while the Golden Hill Community Plan area forms portions of the Park's eastern and southern boundaries.

The North Park Community Plan area (North Park community or North Park) comprises ~~approximately 2,300~~ 2,258 acres (approximately 3.6 square miles) and is located in the central portion of the City of San Diego and is in close proximity to Downtown San Diego. North Park abuts the community planning areas of Uptown on the west, Mission Valley on the north, Mid-City on the east, and Golden Hill and Balboa Park on the south. North Park is defined by its mesa tops with canyon and hillside areas. The majority of North Park is relatively flat or gently sloping with pronounced hillside areas located in the northern boundary of the community adjacent to Mission Valley and the southeastern portion of the community adjacent to Golden Hill. North Park contains the neighborhoods of Altadena, Burlingame, Montclair, North Park, and University Heights.

The Golden Hill Community Plan area (Golden Hill community or Golden Hill) is an urbanized community consisting of approximately 750 acres (approximately 1.2 square miles), located east of downtown San Diego and adjacent to Balboa Park. It comprises the Golden Hill and South Park neighborhoods. The Golden Hill community boundary is Balboa Park and Juniper Street on the north, 32nd Street between Juniper Street and Hawthorn Street, then along Marlton Drive to the 34th Street canyon to Beech Street on the east, State Route (SR) 94 on the south and I-5 on the west.

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
(cont.)	accordance with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions. The commercial uses that would be constructed under the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would include uses such as retail, restaurants, and small offices that would not require heavy mechanical equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or heavy truck deliveries. Residential and civic uses do not typically generate vibration. Thus, operational vibration impacts associated with the proposed North Park CPU implementation and associated discretionary actions would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Historical Resources			
Would implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions result in an alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object, or site?	Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, including the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historical District. This impact would be potentially significant.	**HIST 6.7-1** Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects Prior to issuance of any permit for a development project implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age, the City shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as: age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the Guidelines. Preferred mitigation for historic buildings or structures shall be to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm to the resource shall be taken. Depending upon	**Significant and Unavoidable**

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
		are identified these reports will also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, where possible. If required, mitigation programs can also be included in the report. ~~To further increase protection of potential resources – specifically potential historic districts – the City is proposing to amend the Historical Resources Regulations to include supplemental development regulations to assist in the preservation of specified potential historic districts until they can be intensively surveyed and brought forward for designation.~~	
Would implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric archeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could adversely impact ~~a~~ prehistoric archeological or tribal cultural resources including religious or sacred use sites and human remains. This impact would be potentially significant.	**HIST-6.7-2** Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Prior to issuance of any permit for a ~~future~~ development project implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU that could directly affect an archaeo-logical or tribal cultural resource, the City shall require the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological or tribal cultural resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include	**Significant and Unavoidable**

traditional storefronts associated with small and sole-proprietor businesses remain. A grid pattern of streets has developed in both communities. Vehicular access is affected at many "pinch points" in the communities where street widths narrow or access is "funneled" due to canyon and freeway interfaces.

The CPU areas are urbanized and generally characterized as a mix of residential, commercial, and institutional areas. Both the North Park and the Golden Hill communities have also been part of one of the longest historical development periods in the region due to their central location and various land use plans and zoning programs, which has left a variety of building forms and architectural styles as well as potential historic resources. Both communities developed prior to current Citywide public facilities standards. As a result, locating and financing new facilities, such as parks, is difficult due to lack of available land as well as a limited rate of new development. Aging infrastructure in these communities often needs to be upgraded and/or replaced.

2.2 Project Locations

2.2.1 North Park Community Plan Update Area

The North Park CPU area (North Park community or North Park) comprises ~~approximately 2,300~~ 2,258 acres (approximately 3.6 square miles) and is located in the central portion of the City of San Diego and is in close proximity to Downtown San Diego (Figure 2-3). North Park abuts the community planning areas of Uptown on the west, Mission Valley on the north, Mid-City on the east, and Golden Hill and Balboa Park on the south. North Park is defined by its mesa tops with canyon and hillside areas. The majority of North Park is relatively flat or gently sloping with pronounced hillside areas located in the northern boundary of the community adjacent to Mission Valley and the southeastern portion of the community adjacent to Golden Hill. North Park contains the neighborhoods of Altadena, Burlingame, Montclair, North Park, and University Heights.

2.2.2 Golden Hill Community Plan Update Area

The Golden Hill CPU area (Golden Hill community or Golden Hill) is an urbanized community consisting of approximately 750 acres (approximately 1.2 square miles), located east of downtown San Diego and adjacent to Balboa Park. It comprises the Golden Hill and South Park neighborhoods. The Golden Hill community boundary is Balboa Park and Juniper Street on the north, 32nd Street between Juniper Street and Hawthorn Street, then along Marlton Drive to the 34th Street canyon to Beech Street on the east, State Route 94 (SR-94) on the south and Interstate 5 (I-5) on the west (Figure 2-4).

5.3.2.5 SB 375 - Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act

SB 375 has four key components. First, SB 375 requires regional GHG emissions targets. CARB's Regional Targets Advisory Committee will guide the adoption of targets to be met by 2020 and 2035 for each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the state. For the City of San Diego~~Carlsbad~~, the MPO is San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG; see below). These targets, which MPOs may propose themselves, will be updated every eight years in conjunction with the revision schedule for housing and transportation elements.

Second, MPOs will be required to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that provides a plan for meeting regional targets. The SCS and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must be consistent with each other, including action items and financing decisions. If the SCS does not meet the regional target, the MPO must produce an alternative planning strategy that details an alternative plan to meet the target.

Third, SB 375 requires that regional housing elements and transportation plans (also prepared by SANDAG as the MPO for San Diego County) be synchronized on eight-year schedules. In addition, Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation numbers must conform to the SCS. If local jurisdictions are required to rezone land as a result of changes in the housing element, rezoning must take place within three years.

Finally, MPOs must use transportation and air emissions modeling techniques consistent with guidelines prepared by the CTC. Regional transportation planning agencies (such as SANDAG) are encouraged, but not required, to use travel demand models consistent with the CTC guidelines.

The SANDAG region was the first region in the state that adopted a SCS and RTP update under SB 375.

5.3.3 Local Regulations

5.3.3.1 San Diego Forward: The ~~SANDAG~~ Regional ~~Transportation~~ Plan

SANDAG is the regional authority that creates regional-specific documents to provide guidance to local agencies, as SANDAG does not have land use authority. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RP) combines two of the region's existing planning documents: The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the RTP and SCS. The RCP, adopted in 2004, laid out key principles for managing the region's growth while preserving natural resources and limiting urban sprawl. The RCP covered eight policy areas, including urban form, transportation, housing, healthy environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, our borders, and social equity. These policy areas were addressed in the 2050 RTP/SCS and are now fully integrated into the RP.~~The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is the long-range planning document developed to address the region's housing, economic, transportation, environmental, and overall quality-of-life needs. The RCP establishes a planning framework and implementation actions that increase the region's sustainability and encourage~~

Table 2-1, North Park Existing Land Uses provides the acreage of land area covered by land use category for the existing conditions. Descriptions of the categories from the City's General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element (Table LU-4) that are applicable to the North Park community are presented in Table 5-1, General Plan Land Use Categories. Application of these categories for consistency with the General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element is accomplished with approval of individual CPUs.

Adopted North Park Community Plan

The adopted North Park Community Plan (1986) covers the Greater North Park Community Plan area~~approximately 1,466 acres~~. The adopted Community Plan provides more detailed land use, design, roadway, and implementation information than what is found at the General Plan level. The adopted Community Plan identifies key issues in the community and enumerates a set of objectives to achieve the community's vision. Specific goals, objectives, and policies to implement the adopted North Park Community Plan are contained in its elements: Housing, Commercial, Transportation and Circulation, Community Facilities, Park and Recreation, Open Space, Conservation, Cultural and Heritage Resources, and Urban Design. The adopted North Park Community Plan would be replaced by the proposed North Park CPU.

6.1.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

The determination of significance regarding any inconsistency with development regulations or plan policies is evaluated in terms of the potential for the inconsistency to result in environmental impacts considered significant under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts related to land use are based on applicable criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G and the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2011). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the proposed North Park CPU. A significant land use impact would occur if implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and other associated discretionary approvals would:

1) Conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan or Community Plan or other applicable land use plan or regulation, and as a result, cause an indirect or secondary environmental impact;

2) Lead to development or conversion of General Plan or Community Plan designated open space or prime farmland to a more intensive land use, resulting in a physical division of the community;

3) Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; or

4) Result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

The proposed North Park CPU includes a policy that calls for the interim protection of ~~implementation of interim protection measures to preserve the integrity and eligibility of the~~ potential historic districts until such time as they can be intensively surveyed, verified, and brought forward for Historic Designation~~, which are afforded very limited protection under existing regulations~~. In response to this policy, amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations are proposed to provide supplemental development regulations to address how and where modifications can be made on residential properties identified as potentially contributing to specified potential historic districts. These regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and the other associated discretionary actions because the proposed North Park CPU and other associated discretionary actions would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts. Changes to contributing resources within a potential historic district could occur in the existing condition and would not be affected by the proposed North Park CPU and the other associated discretionary actions, with the exception of an increase in development potential at the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District in the area of University Avenue and 30th Street. However, the proposed supplemental development regulations would not address commercial properties and thus, would not reduce the potential impact to contributing commercial properties within this potential historic district. The regulations are proposed to provide additional regulations to protect contributing residential resources within a potential historic district in order to protect the overall integrity of the potential historic district. Development that does not comply with the ~~regulations of the~~ supplemental development regulations would be subject to a Neighborhood Development Permit with deviation findings and mitigation. ~~The amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations would be adopted concurrent with the proposed North Park CPU.~~

While the Municipal Code does provide for the regulation and protection of designated and potential historical resources, and amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations would be consistent with the policies of the Historic Preservation Element to provide ~~additional~~ interim protection ~~for~~ of~~specified~~ potential historic districts, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all historic built environment resources within the North Park CPU area. Thus, potential impacts to historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites could occur where implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and the other associated discretionary actions would result in increased development potential. Since build-out of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would not increase development potential within the residential potential historical districts, build-out of the proposed North Park CPU would not result in a significant impact to these potential historic districts. Additionally, indirect impacts to the potential historical districts are not anticipated because land uses surrounding potential historic districts are not identified as contributing resources to the potential historical districts and development in these areas would be subject to existing General Plan and proposed North Park CPU policies that address development sensitivity to surrounding character. However, where increases in density are proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, potential impacts to historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites and to the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District~~s~~ are considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.7-1 Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site

where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, including the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District.

Issue 2 Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Would implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric archaeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Although the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions do not propose specific development at this time, future development and related construction activities facilitated by the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions at the project level could result in the alteration or disturbance of prehistoric archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, existing religious or sacred lands; or human remains. Grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities associated with future development could affect important (as determined per the Historical Resources Guidelines) archaeological sites or traditional cultural properties that would constitute a significant direct impact.

The City has developed Historic Resource Sensitivity Maps that provide general locations of where historical resources are known to occur or have the potential to occur. These maps were developed in coordination with technical experts and tribal representatives. Upon submittal of ministerial and/or discretionary permit applications, a parcel is reviewed against the Historical Resource Sensitivity Maps specifically to determine whether or not the project has the potential to adversely impact an archaeological resource which may be eligible for individual listing on the local register (SDMC Section 143.0212).

~~The City's Historical Resources Regulations (Section 143.0212 of the SDMC) requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resource Sensitivity Maps specifically to determine whether or not the project has the potential to adversely impact an archaeological resource.~~ This review is supplemented with a project specific records search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File and California OHP CHRIS data by qualified staff. Additionally, a site specific archaeological survey would be required in accordance with Municipal Code requirements. For any subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions where a recorded archaeological site or Tribal Cultural Resource (as defined in the Public Resources Code) is identified, the City would be required to initiate consultation with identified California Indian tribes pursuant to the provisions in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2, in accordance with Assembly Bill 52. Results of the consultation process would determine the nature and extent of any additional archaeological evaluation or changes to the proposed project and appropriate mitigation measures for direct impacts that cannot be avoided.

Avoiding impacts on religious or sacred places or human remains may be unavoidable in certain circumstances when resources are discovered during construction. Although there are no known religious or sacred uses within the North Park CPU area, there is potential for these to be encountered during future construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed

North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions, particularly given the high cultural sensitivity of canyon areas leading into the Mission Valley area.

Similarly, there are no known human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. However, there are many areas within the City where previously unknown prehistoric human remains and prehistoric sites have been uncovered during both archaeological investigations and grading activities. State law addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project. In accordance with State law, these procedures would be followed in the event of accidental discovery of human remains. Specifically, as specified by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are found on a project site during construction or during archaeological work, the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, shall immediately notify the San Diego County Coroner's office by telephone. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. However, the potential for encountering human remains during construction activities remains a possibility. Therefore, significant impacts on religious or sacred use sites or human remains may occur as a result of future development implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions.

The proposed North Park CPU is designed to support the historic preservation goals of the City's General Plan, and contains policies requiring protection and preservation of significant archaeological resources in the Historic Preservation Element of the proposed North Park CPU. Native American consultation early in the project review process is also included in the CPU to identify tribal cultural resources and to develop adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural and religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations and guidelines.

While existing regulations, the Municipal Code, and proposed North Park CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of archaeological resources and human remains, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all archaeological resources within the North Park CPU area. Therefore, potential impacts to archaeological resources are considered significant.

Impact 6.7-2 Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could adversely impact a prehistoric archaeological resource including religious or sacred use sites and human remains.

6.7.5 Significance of Impacts

Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning including the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District (Impact 6.7-1) and could adversely impact a prehistoric archaeological and tribal cultural resources including religious or sacred use sites and human remains (Impact 6.7-2). These impacts would be potentially significant.

mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis.

With respect to potential historic districts, while supplemental development regulations ~~interim protection measures~~ are proposed, until such time as they are intensively surveyed, verified and brought forward for designation consistent with City regulations and procedures, potential impacts to the potential historic districts could occur under both the adopted Community Plan and proposed North Park CPU. With the exception of the 30th Street Commercial potential historical district, impacts to the potential historical districts would not be a result of implementation of the North Park CPU and the other associated discretionary actions since no additional development potential is proposed. However, where development potential would increase compared to the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, ~~would remain significant and unavoidable. Thus, potential~~ impacts to historical resources including historic structures, objects or sites and the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District~~s~~ would be significant and unavoidable.

6.7.7.2 Prehistoric Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Development implemented in accordance with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would potentially result in impacts to significant archaeological and tribal cultural resources, and therefore would be required to implement mitigation measure HIST-6.7-2, which addresses measures to minimize impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and proposed North Park CPU promoting the identification, protection and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historic Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212) which requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps would reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric or historical archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources. However, even with application of the existing regulatory framework and mitigation framework, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to prehistoric resources, sacred sites, and human remains would be minimized, but not to below a level of significance.

Table 6.12-1 Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities				
Parks/ Recreation Facilities	Existing Useable Acreage	Future Useable Acreage	Parks and Recreation Facilities Descriptions	Parks and Recreation Facilities Recommendations
Madison Avenue Pocket Park		0.11	Proposed pocket park located at the intersection of Madison Ave. with Illinois and Boundary Streets, on City right-of- way.	Design and construct passive park amenities, such as seating, walkways and landscaping.
Facility or Building Expansion or Upgrade – None				
SOURCE: Proposed North Park CPU.				

Table 6.12-2 Summary of Existing and Proposed Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities	
Population-Based Parks	Useable Acres
Existing Population-based Parks and Park Equivalencies	16.37 acres
Proposed Population-based Parks and Park Equivalencies	88.30~~45~~ acres
Total Existing and Proposed Population-based Parks and Equivalencies	104.67~~82~~ acres
Population-based Park Requirements at full community development	204.88 acres
Population-based park deficit at full community development	100.21~~06~~ acres
Recreation Centers	Square Feet
Existing North Park Recreation Center Building, 11,232 square feet, to be replaced with a new facility for a for a total of 17,000 square feet.	17,000 SF
Existing Recreation Center: Morley Field Pétanque Center	1,548 SF
Existing North Park Adult Center Building, 1,706 SF existing, to be replaced with a new facility for a total of 3,000 ST	3,000 SF
Proposed Recreation Center: Morley Field Recreation Center	28,262 SF
Total Existing and Proposed Recreation Centers	49,810 SF
Recreation Center Requirement at full community development	49,810 SF
Recreation Center Deficit at full community development	No Deficit
Aquatic Complexes	Unit
Existing Aquatic Complex: Bud Kearns Community Swimming Pool	1.00
Proposed Aquatic Complex addition: Bud Kearns Community Swimming Pool	0.94*
Total Existing and Proposed Aquatic Complexes	1.94*
Aquatic Complexes Requirement at full community development	1.46*
Aquatic Complex deficit at full community development	No Deficit
*Bud Kearns Community Swimming Pool will be shared. Greater Golden Hill requires 0.48, and North Park requires 1.46, aquatic complexes. The proposed, larger facility will satisfy the combined requirements (1.94 aquatic complexes) for both communities.	
Note: Identification of private property as a potential park site does not preclude permitted development per the designated land use. SOURCE: Proposed North Park CPU.	

A total of 204.88 acres of population-based parks would be needed to serve North Park at full community development, of which 16.37 currently exist. Through the proposed North Park CPU effort, City staff and community members have identified 88.30~~45~~ acres of proposed new population-based park land and park equivalency sites within and adjacent to the North Park community, that when implemented would reduce the existing population-based park deficit to 100.21~~06~~ acres.

Build-out of the proposed North Park CPU would add additional population to the CPU area and the CPU area would continue to have a deficit of population based parks at build-out; which would be an adverse impact. Future development proposed within the CPU area would be subject to payment of DIF for public facilities financing in accordance with Municipal Code Section 142.0640. The project includes a comprehensive update to the existing Impact Fee Study for North Park would define applicable DIF fees for future development including fees for park funding. However, fees would not be adequate to address the extent of the parkland deficit. Payment and receipt of DIF funds is contingent on future development and proposed fees are not designed to fully fund and address the parkland deficit.

The proposed North Park CPU Recreation Element provides a policy framework that supports acquisition and development of new public parks and park equivalencies and encourages new private development to include recreational facilities.

Thus, although the existing and projected deficit in population-based parks is adverse, impacts associated with the construction of park facilities would be less than significant at the program-level. Implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks in the CPU area, but does not propose construction of new facilities. Thus, implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would result in a less than significant impact associated with the construction of new facilities in order to maintain performance objectives for parks.

c. Fire/Life Safety Protection

With the implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions, there would be an increase in overall population which could result in a change in response times. However, future facilities would be planned based on adopted General Plan Public Facilities Element standards detailed in Chapter 5.0, Regulatory Framework (Section 5.12.1.3) of this PEIR. The proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions does not propose the construction of fire/life safety facilities. However, the proposed North Park CPU contains a policy framework that addresses maintaining the high level of fire protection throughout the North Park community. Additionally, as future development is proposed within the North Park CPU area, individual projects would be subject to payment of DIF, which would provide facilities financing in accordance with Municipal Code Section 142.0640. The project includes a comprehensive update to the existing Impact Fee Study for North Park that will define applicable DIF fees for future development, including funding for fire facilities.

At the programmatic level the proposed increase in population would not require that the Fire-Rescue Department construct new facilities. Any expansion construction of existing facilities or the

for specified potential historic ~~preservation~~ districts that are identified~~ncluded~~ with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions. Therefore, while land use impacts would still be less than significant under this alternative, impacts would be greater in comparison to the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions.

b. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

Potential visual effects and impacts to neighborhood character under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those anticipated under the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions; however, the no project alternative would not include proposed design guidelines and policies intended to enhance and preserve community character. While the proposed North Park CPU does include increases in density and building heights such as those within the Community Plan Enhancement Program areas, generally the proposed North Park CPU and the No Project Alternative would produce similar bulk and scale development. However, the No Project Alternative would also not include proposed North Park CPU policies that reduce the impact of future development on community character, preserve historic resources, preserve the structural and visual integrity of the areas' landform, and establish appropriate uses of lighting and encourage lighting design that minimizes light pollution and excess glare. In addition, the proposed North Park CPU includes policies that address the potential impacts associated with development in the Community Plan Enhancement Program areas; policies which would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative.

Similar to the No Project Alternative, the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions would not propose any specific developments that would substantially alter existing or planned character or involve the grading or alteration of steep slopes, and all future development would be required to comply with existing regulations regarding grading activities and lighting design. Therefore, impacts for the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar or slightly reduced compared to the proposed North Park CPU.

c. Transportation

The No Project Alternative would generate fewer vehicular trips than the proposed North Park CPU. However, the No Project Alternative does not contain the proposed North Park CPU policies intended to promote a multimodal network that encourage walking, bicycling, and use of transit. Nor does the No Project Alternative contain policies that support the policies of SANDAG's San Diego Forward. While impacts to individual intersections and roadway segments would be lesser in the No Project Alternative than the proposed North Park CPU, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because similar to the proposed CPU, build-out of land uses would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to roadway segments and intersections since improvements necessary to mitigate impacts are not necessarily supported by the CPU polices and no guaranteed funding mechanism is available. In addition, the No Project Alternative is not consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy as well as the implementation strategy of the Climate Action Plan.

LETTER

STANDING OF NPHS

B3-11 The standing of NPHS in the North Park Community Plan Update (NPCPU) portion of the Project is based on our activities within the Greater North Park Community Planning Area, where significant impacts from the Project would occur. Most of the residences and commercial buildings within the community planning area are of historic age, and the entire area constitutes the outdoor classroom NPHS uses to teach the importance of historical preservation and the unique story of North Park's historical resources. Specifically, we conduct a popular walking tour in the commercial area along University Avenue at 30th Street, which the NPCPU has zoned for a density of 109 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and buildings of unlimited height. This area has been identified as a potential commercial historic district by the City's historical resources consultant, and was identified by NPHS as one of our highest priorities for designation.

B3-12 NPHS also conducts a walking tour called "The Streetcar Suburb at Hamilton Street," which covers development patterns and historic resources in an area extending from Arizona Street to Utah Street and Wightman Street to Howard Avenue. Much of this part of the historic University Heights subdivision has been identified in the NPCPU as the "Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program Area," where development up to 73 du/ac, nearly twice the NPCPU zoned density of 44 du/ac, is encouraged for projects where 6 or more units are proposed. The starting point for our Hamilton Streetcar Suburb walking tour is the North Park Water Tower at Howard Avenue between Oregon and Idaho Streets. We recently achieved listing of the Water Tower and surrounding district of water infrastructure in the National Register of Historic Places as well as in the City's list of designated historic resources. Properties adjacent to the Water Tower parcel have a proposed density of 54 du/ac and a 50-foot height limit; properties east and west of the community park, which was once a 17.5-million-gallon, partially buried water reservoir and thus is part of the historic district, have a proposed density of 73 du/ac and 60-foot height.

B3-13 The historical character and integrity of the Greater North Park Community Planning Area is of great concern to NPHS. Without the outdoor classroom, the story of North Park, a living example of a historic walkable community, will become abstract, remote, and of little concern to people. Our walking tours are the principal way we engage the community and create members and donors. Walking tours and other related activities provide the revenue and community exposure NPHS needs to thrive as an all-volunteer non-profit organization and, most importantly, accomplish our mission. Through our mission and activities, NPHS has a clear, present, and beneficial right to the City adequately carrying out its duties as Lead Agency and meeting the requirements of CEQA for the Project. We appreciate the opportunity to enter into the administrative record our comments on the PEIR for the North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates.

COMMENTS ON EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section S.3: Areas of Controversy

B3-14 The PEIR states that there are no clear-cut areas of controversy. This is false. NPHS and the University Heights Historical Society have written multiple letters objecting to the Pedestrian-

RESPONSE

B3-11 The area that this comment refers to is depicted as the 30th Street Commercial District in Figure 6.7-4 of the Draft PEIR which is identified as the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District in the proposed North Park CPU (see Figure 10-3). There are height regulations in this area. The maximum height allowed within the CC-3-9 zone that is proposed for this area is governed by maximum floor area ratio (FAR). For a stand-alone commercial structure, the maximum FAR is 2.0. If a project incorporates residential and is considered a mixed-use building, a FAR of 5.0 can be achieved. However, the proposed supplemental development regulations would not apply to commercial structures within a Potential Historic District and thus would not reduce potential impacts to contributing commercial properties. Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 would apply to residential and commercial development alike to avoid or mitigate impacts to historically significant buildings; however, at this program level of analysis, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation cannot be known for each specific future project. Thus, the Draft PEIR concludes that impacts to ~~potential~~ historical resources ~~districts~~ would be significant and unavoidable.

B3-12 The area that this comment refers to is depicted as the University Heights Water Storage and Pumping Station in Figure 6.7-4 of the Draft PEIR. This comment does not identify an inadequacy in the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR.

B3-13 This comment does not identify an inadequacy in the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR. The City appreciates the NPHS's participation in the public review process. All comments will be considered during the decision-making process.

B3-14 Section S.3 Areas of Controversy has been updated to acknowledge these concerns.

in a manner that ensures that the physical attributes of the North Park community would be retained and enhanced by design that responds to the community's particular context: its physical setting, cultural and social amenities, and historical assets." However, structures built to the allowable density of 73 du/ac under the Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program in an area of historic-age single family homes and two-story apartment complexes would by definition result in a substantial change in bulk and scale to the existing character. This is a significant impact no amount of setbacks or design features can avoid.

- On page 6.2-8, principles of the Urban Design Framework include: "A respect and appreciation for the history and culture of the community as expressed in historic districts." Since most of the Greater North Park Community Planning Area was built out by the 1950s, its history and culture are reflected throughout the planning area, not just in the few designated and proposed historic districts. Limiting respect and appreciation to only historic districts creates the potential for substantial alterations in bulk, scale, materials or style to all other neighborhood areas. In addition, proposed historic districts are not protected. As an example, zoning within the proposed 30th Street/University Avenue Commercial Historic District (shown on Figure 1-3 and listed in Table 10-4 of the June 2016 NPCPU) would be up to 109 du/ac with buildings of unlimited height. This is a significant impact no amount of setbacks or design features can avoid.

B3-56 On page 6.2-10, the PEIR concludes that the "regulatory framework would ensure that future development within the CPU area is compatible with the surrounding environment and does not degrade the character or quality of the area." However, no analysis is provided to substantiate this conclusion. In fact, as illustrated by the examples above, the proposed zoning and programs of the NPCPU, notably the Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program, will create incompatible development that will certainly lead to degradation of the historic character and quality of North Park. Far from being "less than significant," the NPCPU will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to neighborhood character that must be disclosed to decision makers and stakeholders.

B3-57 Potential impacts to neighborhood character require analysis, disclosure, and mitigation. Correcting this deficiency in the PEIR will require the addition of "significant new information" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a)(1). Adequate analysis will reveal that (1) new significant environmental impacts would result from the Project in areas where substantial increases in density resulting from changes in zoning and incentives (in particular within the Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program area) would lead to incompatible development that would degrade the character and quality of the area; (2) new mitigation measures would be needed; and (3) not providing this new information and recirculating the PEIR would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project.

B3-55 (cont.)

with the regulations of the supplemental development regulations would be subject to a Neighborhood Development Permit with deviation findings and mitigation. The amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations would be adopted concurrent with the proposed North Park CPU. However, the proposed CPUs would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts, meaning any changes to contributing residential resources within a potential historic district under the proposed CPUs could also occur under the adopted Community Plan. Increases in commercial density that would occur under the proposed CPUs could result in impacts to contributing commercial resources, but the proposed supplemental development regulations would not address commercial properties and thus, would not reduce the potential impact to contributing commercial properties within this potential historic district. As such, the supplemental development regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions, though they would provide additional protections.

Regardless, wherever an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan, impacts to historic resources may occur. ~~However, ultimately~~ Even with implementation of mitigation framework (mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1), the Draft PEIR ultimately concludes that impacts to ~~potential~~ historical resources ~~districts~~ would be significant and unavoidable. ~~because a~~At a program level of analysis the degree and specificity of impacts for individual projects and applicability of the future mitigation cannot be known. Regarding height limits in the Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Program area, height is regulated through FAR. In this area, the maximum FAR is 2.0.

B3-56 The City does not agree that the North Park CPU will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to neighborhood character. A discussion of how the regulatory framework would ensure compatibility of future development with the surrounding community character is included in Section 6.2.3, Issue 3 of the PEIR, where the Urban Design Element policies are discussed. For example, policies specific to each design area (Centers, Corridors, and Neighborhoods) would ensure future development considers the individual character of each setting. In addition, policies also ensure compatible transitions between higher density and lower density

B4-5 Several mitigation methods refer the reader to an unspecified and unattached Implementation Plan. CEQA Regulations require public access and ability to comment on all documents referenced in a CEQA mitigation measure. The Implantation Plan is not included for the public to review and therefore, does not meet the standards for public review. CEQA requires the reader an opportunity to review all studies and plans referenced in a mitigation measure. The inability for the public to analyze and comment on the so called Implementation Plan calls into question whether the public could fully analyze the EIR and its mitigation measures.

B4-6 Mitigation Measure HIST 6.7-21 merely re-states the current (and inadequate due to lack of enforcement and implementation) City Policy regarding application of the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and does not provide meaningful mitigation that will continue to protect North Park historic resources during implementation of the NPCPU. Citing a General Plan policy does not constitute a mitigation measure. Impacts to historic districts are not mitigated and the process for protecting them is still vague at best and no-existent at worse. However, there are still possible mitigation methods available for North Park.

B4-7 **When a PEIR includes the number of errors, lack of adequate documentation and general inadequacies as this one does, the analysis and conclusions cannot be trusted and provide limited and suspect guidance for future development.**

NPPC Board Members have expressed satisfied with the NPCPU, if not the PEIR, and would like to see the NPCPU move forward. However, they will only do so if there are significant and binding mitigations offered by the City and at the very least a timeline and commitment to provide the requested studies and analyses.

Please find attached the unanimously approved NPPC Comments of July 19, 2016 on the North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates.

Sincerely

Vicki Granowitz Chair
North Park Planning Committee

cc: Councilmember Todd Gloria
Jeff Murphy, Director of Planning Department City of San Diego
Alyssa Mutto, Deputy Director of Planning Department City of San Diego
Nancy Bragado, Deputy Director of Planning Department City of San Diego
Tait Galloway, Manager Planning Department City of San Diego
Lara Gates, Senior Planner City of San Diego
Chris Ward

B4-5 Section 12, Implementation, of the proposed North Park CPU and Section 11, Implementation, of the proposed Golden Hill CPU provide the implementation plans for the proposed CPUs and, therefore, were available for public review.

B4-6 Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 call for avoidance, which is preferred, or site-specific mitigation of historical resources impacts for any development implemented in accordance with the proposed CPUs. In addition, the proposed CPUs provide adequate flexibility and incentive for preservation of historic resources. The proposed North Park CPU would not result in impacts to potential historic districts in residential areas because the project would not increase development intensity beyond the adopted Community Plan in these areas. Thus, adoption of supplemental development regulations is not needed to mitigate impacts to potential historic districts. ~~Impacts to~~Further, the North Park CPU includes policies that call for protections to potential historic districts and identifies the potential historic districts in the Historic Resources Element.~~ are addressed through the proposed inclusion of amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations that provide supplemental development regulations for potential contributing resources.~~ Despite the inclusion of feasible mitigation measures, i~~I~~mpacts to potential historic districts are addressed through the proposed inclusion of amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations that provide supplemental development regulations for potential contributing resources. Impacts to historical resources remain significant and unavoidable because the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at a program level of analysis. Thus, the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources is not a result of lack of identified feasible mitigation.

B4-7 This comment suggests a general inadequacy with the PEIR which are laid out in more detail in the referenced comments that are attached. Those concerns are addressed in the responses that follow.

LETTER

North Park Planning Committee - PEIR Comments
Project Name: North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates
Project No. 380611 / SCH No 2013121076
pg. 13 of 18

Correction:

This error should be corrected by immediately releasing the IFS and accompanying analysis, and either extending the public review period by 30 days or possibly recirculation of the PEIR.

B4-48 **Section 6.7: Historic Preservation**

Mitigation Measure HIST 6.7-21 merely re-states the current (and inadequate due to lack of enforcement and implementation) City Policy regarding application of the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and does not provide meaningful mitigation that will continue to protect North Park historic resources during implementation of the NPCPU. Citing a General Plan policy does not constitute a mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure HIST 6.7-21 states that *"to further increase protection of potential resources – specifically potential historic districts – the City is proposing to amend the Historical Resources Regulations to include supplemental development regulations to assist in the preservation of specified potential historic districts until they can be intensively surveyed and brought forward for designation"*.

1) Because the above cited Proposed Draft Historical Resources Regulations (PDHRR) being amended in the Land Development Code (LDC) have neither been finalized, received an appropriate public noticing or vetting, nor have they been analyzed in this PEIR as is required under CEQA.

2) These PDHRRs were presented for the first time to the public on July 19, 2016 (less than a week before the end of the public comment period for this PEIR), precluding the possibility of their analysis in this document, therefore rendering these proposed PDHRR no mitigation at all under CEQA.

3) The explanation given by City staff that "this PDHRR is no different from the original draft zoning ordinance proposal" is nonsensical, inaccurate, and specious. The NPPC and the North Park Community have consistently placed Historic Resources Protection at the level of very highest importance in their input to the City during this Community Plan Update process. The NPPC and the North Park community have worked hard and unceasingly for 8 years to assist City Staff to meet this most important CPU planning goal It is entirely unacceptable and un-analyzable under CEQA to have this last-minute change sprung on the community after the community has agreed to accept density increases in exchange for promised increased protections for North Park's unique historic resources including but not limited to the North Park Main Street commercial area, A Bungalow Court Multiple Listing District and implementation of community identified Historic Districts.

4) The content of the proposed amendment of the Historical Resources Regulations has not been finalized or received appropriate public noticing, is not analyzed in this PEIR, therefore cannot be cited as a mitigation.

RESPONSE

B4-48 This comment suggests that mitigation measure HIST 6.7-1 simply restates current City policy, which is not accurate. ~~The measure includes the proposed supplemental development regulations for the preservation of potential historic districts. In addition,~~ HIST 6.7-1 ~~also~~ calls for a historical resources evaluation prior to issuance of any development permit where a building in excess of 45 years old may be affected.

Additionally, the proposed supplemental development regulations would provide additional protection, addressing how and where modifications can be made on residential properties. However, these regulations are not required to reduce impacts because the proposed North Park and Golden Hill CPUs would not increase residential development potential in any identified potential historic district and the potential for changes to occur to contributing resources would be the same as in the existing condition. The protection measures for potential historic districts were first introduced to the community via workshop and posted to the City's website in March 2016. In May 2016, the implementation mechanism for the protection measures was changed to amend the Historical Resources Regulations; however, the protection measures proposed remained the same. The proposed amendments to the City's Historical Resources Regulations were made publicly available on the City's North Park Community Plan Update webpage (https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/draft_potential_historic_district_regulations_05312016.pdf) on May 31, 2016.

Section 3.4.2.2, Amendment to the Historic Resources Regulations, of the PEIR provides a description of the amendments, which are a feature of the project. Amendments to the Land Development Code, such as the Historic Resources Regulation amendments, are discretionary actions associated with implementation of the proposed CPUs and were appropriately analyzed in the PEIR. The draft amendments to the City's Historical Resources Regulations would be adopted at the time of the proposed North Park CPU adoption. The discretionary action to approve code amendments was included in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the PEIR (see Table 3-1) and analyzed in the PEIR.

B4-51 (cont.)

and productivity to reduce processing times. In this interim period between adoption of the Community Plan Update and processing of the potential historic districts, five of the potential historic districts identified in the Historic Resources Survey will be protected through the supplemental regulations. Additionally, the remaining six potential historic districts will receive some level of protection through the current review process for buildings 45 years old or older. Regardless, the proposed supplemental development regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions because the project would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts. Changes to contributing resources within a potential historic district could occur in the existing condition and would not be affected by the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions, with the exception of an increase in development potential at the 30th Street Commercial Potential Historic District in the area of University Avenue and 30th Street.

B4-52 Working with the Community Planning Groups, the City has prepared a draft proposed work program for intensively surveying and processing the potential historic districts, and will be seeking the resources necessary to implement the work program.

B4-53 This comment does not suggest an inadequacy in the Draft PEIR. Rather, it suggests a revision to the proposed North Park CPU to exclude historic resources from development floor area ratio calculations. Because new development is already required to comply with development regulations that preserve the character of historic resources, this suggested mitigation would not further protect historic resources.

North Park Planning Committee - PEIR Comments
Project Name: North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates
Project No. 380611 / SCH No 2013121076
pg. 15 of 18

B4-54 **5)** Exclude historic resources from parking calculations to provide a reduced requirement when retaining a historic building. This is particularly important in the preservation of bungalow courts; This would meet the General Plan's goal for allowing increased density in the Mid-City Area, facilitating affordable housing, meeting sustainability goals of the Climate Action Plan by retaining existing infrastructure which would not have to go to a landfill, while also meeting the NPCP goal of protecting historic resources from demolition or removal from the area.

B4-55 **6)** Include city-wide transferable development rights (TDR), enabling property owners to buy/sell rights so growth will result in appropriate areas, near transit and amenities. This would meet the General Plan's goal for allowing increased density in the Mid-City Area, facilitating affordable housing, meeting sustainability goals of the Climate Action Plan by retaining existing infrastructure which would not have to go to a landfill, while also meeting the NPCP goal of protecting historic resources from demolition or removal from the area.

B4-56 **7)** Remove the "1/3 option" in the proposed Land Development Code (LDC) & replace with protections consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Review for all community proposed Historic Districts, including Commercial districts and the proposed Multiple Listing Bungalow Court District. The proposed "1/3 option" is not only not analyzed in this document, it has no precedent or analysis Stat-wide; whereas the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Review are well documented and analyzed under CEQA as providing mitigation protections, and provide a more consistent and well understood framework, thereby providing greater developer certainty.

B4-57 Further, he term "original footprint" with regard to the "1/3 Option" is not clearly defined and could lead to trivial disputes. Also, the 2/3 rule does not adequately protect corner properties and will facilitate obtrusive and odd-shaped rear additions, which will be detrimental to a potential district. This provision is confusing and likely difficult to implement, and it's potentially very negative impacts to Historic Resources are unanalyzed in this PEIR document.

Solution: Remove "original footprint" language. Include language stating that additional stories and structural changes shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Small additions (less than 300 square feet) and façade changes shall be limited to side and rear facades, and be minimally visible from the public rights-of-way.

B4-58 **8)** In order to effectively protect potential districts from incompatible change, i.e. scale, bulk, rhythm, and materials, for parcels that do not include a historic resource, but are located within a potential district; comprehensive infill guidelines for these potential districts are needed. Infill guidelines are necessary to ensure the potential historic district remains intact until such time when the district is brought forward. Without

B4-54 This comment does not suggest an inadequacy in the PEIR; rather, it requests a revision to the proposed North Park CPU to provide reduced parking requirements for development retaining historic resources. Policies included under Section 3.5, Parking, of the proposed North Park CPU call for reduced residential parking incentives that would provide similar benefits to those suggested for development retaining historic resources. In addition, City-wide zoning provides for the processing of Planned Development Permits to deviate from development regulations such as parking requirements, when the requested deviation would result in a more desirable project.

B4-55 This comment does not suggest an inadequacy in the Draft PEIR; rather, it requests inclusion of transferable development rights to encourage growth within appropriate areas. The proposed CPUs focus higher-density development along major transit and pedestrian corridors and meet the goals of the City of Villages Strategy and Climate Action Plan. The requested revision would not serve to further these goals.

B4-56 The purpose and intent of the supplemental regulations is to provide additional ~~adequate~~ protection of potential historic districts, to preserve their overall integrity and eligibility for historic designation, without applying the same development standards and criteria applied to designated historic resources. The supplemental regulations would allow alterations to the rear third of a building, which would generally not be visible from the street and would serve to preserve the original façade of buildings. Therefore, the regulation would provide additional protection of contributing residential resources within a potential historic district, in order to protect the overall integrity of the potential historic district.~~appropriately protect historic resources and maintain their consistency with the historic character of the community.~~

B4-57 The "original footprint" of a building refers to the outline of the total existing building area. This term is commonly used by the City and developers, and is not anticipated to result in dispute. Following public review and in response to public comments, the City has proposed changes to the supplemental regulations for potential historic districts to specifically address corner lots, and to define the term "original primary façade." These revisions are now available at https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/draft_potential_historic_district_regulations_05312016.pdf.

LETTER	RESPONSE
	B4-58 The supplemental development regulations included in the proposed amendments to the Historic Resources Regulations pertain to modifications to contributing residential resources within potential historical districts. In addition, mitigation measure HIST 6.7-1 includes historic evaluation requirements for any development permit with the potential to affect a building or structure older than 45 years of age. The only properties not regulated by the Historical Resources Regulations would be those properties that are neither individually significant nor contributing resources to the potential historic district as well as commercial properties. However, proposed zoning throughout the CPU area, including in potential historic districts have been assigned with consideration to various factors including the potential historic value of a particular area. However, the supplemental development regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed North Park and Golden Hill CPUs and associated discretionary actions because the project would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts. Changes to residential contributing resources within a potential historic district could occur in the existing condition and would not be affected by the proposed CPUs. Infill guidelines applicable to non-contributing resources would not be needed because existing zoning and Land Development Code requirements would provide adequate regulations for bulk and scale appropriate to each specific Potential Historic District. Therefore, additional infill development guidelines are not needed, and mitigation for potential impacts to historical resources have been appropriately identified in the PEIR.

such guidelines and an analysis thereof, this PEIR fails to analyze potential mitigations to historic resources.

B4-59 **9)** Because no permit is currently required for so doing, the potential Draft Regulation Amendments to the LDC regulations (143.0210) do not adequately protect historic resources from the installation of replacement doors and windows when placed within the same opening, This lack is detrimental to any potential Historic district, could render the historic asset no longer contributing or eligible for a district, and therefore language should be developed and included in the CPU and LDC requiring such permits. Current City of San Diego General Plan and LDC provide no such protection, thus the PEIR's contention that these documents protect North Park is unsubstantiated.

Solution: All window and door replacements that fall within the proposed Land Development Code must require a building permit. Accordingly, add to Table 132-16B of Section 132.1602, for improvements consisting of replacement windows: (i) replacement windows that do comply with Section 132.1603 will require a

Construction Permit/Process One decision process, and (ii) replacement window that do not comply with Section 132.1603 will require a Neighborhood Development Permit/Process Two decision process.

B4-60 **10)** To effectively protect the potential district from inappropriate change, infill design guidelines should be created:

B4-61 **11)** Survey and implement the multiple listing for Bungalow Courts as a stand-alone district: Preservation of these historic affordable housing units meets the goals of the City's Climate Action plan, and their loss to infill development due to inadequate protection would constitute a significand and unavoidable impact under CEQA that an accelerated district implementation would prevent.

B4-62 **12)** Provide adequate enforceable protections for the potential historic districts. Due to inadequately funded and supported code enforcement, the City has not provided adequate code enforcement for Historic Resources in all areas of the City. City must provide a plan and funding for adequate code enforcement to ensure there is not a loss of historic fabric, rendering buildings no longer contributing to potential districts

Solution: Code Compliance issues within potential historic districts should be near the top of the priority list. In addition to higher monetary penalties, any features removed in violation shall be reconstructed. Residents of potential districts should 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.

B4-59 Existing regulations addressing officially designated historic properties require the review and approval of all modifications to the historic property, including windows and doors. This would not change with the proposed North Park CPU and associated discretionary actions. Additionally, existing building permit exemptions which apply to non-designated properties will also not change with this PEIR or the proposed supplemental regulations. The proposed supplemental development regulations were developed to allow contributing resources within potential historic districts to retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the district. Window replacements within the original openings, which are the only window modifications exempt from a permit, do not in and of themselves preclude a building from contributing to a historic district. Additionally, the proposed CPUs include policies to better inform and educate the public, including businesses, on the merits of historic preservation as well as to promote the maintenance and restoration of privately owned historical resources through incentive programs. In addition, it is unreasonable to impose a building permit for all window and door replacements within the community, as this comment suggests.

B4-60 Please see response to comment B4-58.

B4-61 Bungalow courts were identified by the Historic Resource Survey as a Multiple Property listing, not a historic district, as they lack sufficient geographic concentration to be eligible as a historic district. Improvements or modifications to bungalow courts that are designated as historic properties; designated as a contributing resource to a designated historic district; or identified as potentially individually significant would be subject to review for consistency with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards in accordance with the Historical Resources Regulations. Additionally, ~~bungalow courts which do not fall within the categories above but nonetheless contribute to a potential historic district would be subject to the proposed supplemental development regulations when located within potential historic districts.~~ Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 serve to mitigate or avoid potential impacts to bungalow courts found to be historically significant within the North Park and Golden Hill CPU areas. ~~Therefore,~~ While the mitigation framework combined with the proposed CPU policies are intended to ~~these resources would be~~ appropriately protect~~ed~~ historical resources, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis and a significant and unavoidable impact was identified.

Letter B8

Brandt-Hawley Law Group

Chauvet House • PO Box 1659
Glen Ellen, California 95442
707.938.3900 • fax 707.938.3200
preservationlawyers.com

July 28, 2016

Kurtis Steinert
Senior Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
Via email: PlanningCEQA@sandiego.gov

PROJECT NAME: North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates
PROJECT No. 380611

PROJECT NAME: Uptown Community Plan Update
PROJECT No. 21002568

Dear Mr. Steinert:

B8-1 On behalf of Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO), these comments address the draft environmental impact reports (EIRs) for the pending updates to the community plans for Golden Hill, North Park, and Uptown. SOHO's overarching concern is that the updates neither identify nor adequately analyze enforceable mitigation for significant impacts to historic resources.

Please respond to each of the following comments:

B8-2 1. CEQA requires that EIRs for projects or plans with potentially significant direct or indirect environmental impacts, including impacts on historic resources, identify and analyze feasible mitigation measures and a range of reasonable alternatives. SOHO contends that to prevent impacts to historic resources that may occur with development that will occur following the community plan updates, identified potential historic districts should be concurrently implemented for all three planning areas. Please revise the EIRs to provide for this feasible mitigation for plan impacts to historic resources or explain why not.

B8-1 Comment noted. The City appreciates the Save Our Heritage Organisation's (SOHO's) participation in the public review comment process. The comment letter will become public record as part of the Final PEIR. All comments will be considered during the decision-making process.

B8-2 The PEIR incorporates all feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the significance of potential impacts to historical resources. ~~The~~ Additionally, the project includes amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations to include supplemental development regulations to assist in the preservation of specified Potential Historic Districts until they can be intensively surveyed and brought forward for designation. However, the proposed CPUs would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts, meaning any changes to contributing residential resources within a potential historic district under the proposed CPUs could also occur under the adopted Community Plan. Increases in commercial density that would occur under the proposed CPUs could result in impacts to contributing commercial resources, but the proposed supplemental development regulations would not address commercial properties and thus, would not reduce the potential impact to contributing commercial properties within this potential historic district. As such, the supplemental development regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed CPUs and associated discretionary actions, though they would provide additional protections. Additionally, the proposed Historic Preservation Elements (HPE) for both North Park and Golden Hill include policies to intensively survey and prepare nominations for the Potential Historic Districts (Golden Hill and North Park HPE Policy HP-2.2). Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 are also proposed to reduce development impacts to historical resources. Nonetheless, the PEIR concludes that even with implementation of the mitigation framework, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at a program level of analysis.

EIR Comments
July 28, 2016
Page 2

B8-3 2. Please also revise the EIRs to identify and analyze the following mitigations to facilitate historic preservation and rehabilitation:

a. Exclude historic resources from calculations of floor area ratio, increasing density for projects that retain an historic resource;

b Exclude historic resources from parking calculations, allowing reduced parking when a project retains an historic resource;

c Include city-wide transferable development rights (TDRs), enabling property owners to buy and sell rights to encourage projects near transit and amenities.

B8-4 3. The EIRs state that plan impacts to historic resources are "significant and unavoidable." Supplemental development regulations proposed to mitigate impacts to potential historic districts require additional implementation measures to be ineffective:

a Will the EIRs be revised to impose timelines for implementation of the regulations, establishing priorities for potential historic districts? If not, why not?

B8-5 *b* Will the EIRs be revised to consider feasible funding for the regulations? If not, won't the mitigation be unenforceable?

B8-6 *c* Will the EIRs be revised to consider amendments to the supplemental development regulations so that they comprehensively apply to all resources within identified potential historic districts? If not, why not?

B8-7 *d* Will the EIRs be revised to apply regulatory protections to community-identified potential historic districts that the City agrees are eligible, the Multiple Property Listings (MPLs), and the commercial properties located within potential districts? If not, why not?

B8-3 Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 call for avoidance, which is preferred, or site-specific mitigation of historic resources impacts for any development implemented in accordance with the proposed CPUs. The proposed CPUs provide adequate flexibility and incentive for preservation of historic resources. In addition, the Municipal Code currently provides incentive opportunities, including Conditional Use Permits to facilitate adaptive reuse and Planned Development Permits to allow for deviations from development standards to achieve a better project, such as one that preserves and incorporates a designated historic resource. Inclusion of the recommended measures is not needed to further reduce significant historical resources impacts. Even if those measures were added, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures would not be known for each specific future project at a program level of analysis and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

B8-4 The proposed supplemental development regulations are not proposed as a mitigation measure, rather they are part of the project. Implementation of the supplemental development regulations would occur concurrent with approval of the CPUs. Thus, the protections for Potential Historic Districts would be in place immediately with adoption of the CPUs and a timeline for implementation of the regulations is not needed. Additionally, as previously stated, the regulations are not required to reduce impacts associated with implementation of the proposed CPUs and associated discretionary actions because the project would not result in any increase in residential development potential in the identified potential historic districts. Because impacts to historical resources could occur wherever an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plans, mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 are proposed to avoid or mitigate these impacts. Significant and unavoidable impacts are identified even after implementation of ~~the~~ this mitigation framework because the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at a program level of analysis. Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 and CPU policies protecting historic resources will be implemented to avoid or reduce impacts resulting from development to the greatest extent feasible. Policies included in the proposed CPUs would be implemented at the time of CPU adoption.

B8-5 As stated in response B8-4 above, the supplemental development regulations (amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations) will be implemented concurrent with the adoption of CPUs. Refer to Section 3.4.2.2

LETTER	RESPONSE
	C18-3 The North Park CPU characterizes the areas within the proposed Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program area as primarily "multi-character areas" (versus traditional character areas), which recognizes there are a variety of housing types including traditional housing as indicated by the commenter. As indicated within Chapter 4 of the CPU, the vision for Multi-Character Neighborhoods is to preserve and enhance traditional architectural and design themes, and to redesign or replace buildings from the 1960s to 1980s with buildings that are consistent with the pedestrian orientation that was originally developed when the streets and sidewalks were built. The Community Plan envisions design flexibility and innovation while ensuring compatibility with the traditional character buildings. C18-4 The City does not agree that the Plan does not adequately protect historic homes. Mitigation measures HIST 6.7-1 and HIST 7.7-1 would apply to any new development and is intended to avoid or mitigate impacts to individually historically significant building. However, at this program level of analysis, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation cannot be known for each specific future project and the EIR concluded a significant and unavoidable impact. The mitigation framework will still be implemented to avoid or mitigate impacts to the highest extent feasible. Within all areas of the proposed North Park CPU, including within the discretionary Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program area, the existing Historical Resources Regulations of the San Diego Municipal Code (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2) would apply. The regulations require applicants to prepare a historic property (built environment) survey for proposed development on properties with structures over 45 years old that appear to have integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. C18-5 The City acknowledges the commenters opposition to the discretionary Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program and the discretionary Transit-Oriented Development Enhancement Program (Community Plan Enhancement Program Areas). These programs are intended to facilitate transit-oriented development and pedestrian-oriented development, by increasing density near transit and commercial services by processing a planned development permit.