



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Committee

AGENDA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

June 2, 2009 (Tuesday) – 6:00-9:00 p.m.

Joyce Beers Community Center, Uptown Shopping District

(Located on Vermont Street between the Terra and Aladdin Restaurants)

I. Board Meeting: Parliamentary Items/ Reports: (6:00 p.m.)

- A. Introductions
- B. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order
- C. Approval of Minutes
- D.. Treasurer's Report
- E. Website Report
- F. Chair/ CPC Report

II. Public Communication – Non-Agenda Public Comment (3 minutes); Speakers are encouraged, although not required, to fill out public comment forms and provide them to the secretary at the beginning of the meeting. **(6:15 p.m.)**

III. Representatives of Elected Officials: (3 minutes each) (6:25 p.m.)

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Action Items: Projects:

- 1. 101 DICKINSON STREET (“SHIRAZ MEDICAL CENTER”) – Process Five –** Medical Complex – Site Development Permit and Rezone from RS-1-1 to demolish existing structures and construct a four-story medical building with height and setback deviations on a 1.4 acre site at 101 Dickinson Street within the Uptown Community Plan, FAA Flight Path, Community Plan Implementation Overlay Area B. **(6:35 p.m.)**
- 2. 2965 FRONT STREET (“QUINCE STREET REZONE/ VACATION”) – Process Five –** Bankers Hill/ Park West -- Public Right of Way Vacation to vacate a portion of West Quince Street and Rezone from RS-1-2 and RS-1-7 at 2965 Front Street; within Airport Influence Zone, FAA Part 77, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. **(7:00 p.m.)**
- 3. 3919 PRINGLE STREET VARIANCE (“BERGER RESIDENCE”) – Process Three –** Mission Hills -- Variance for a 1,261 sq. ft. addition to an existing family residence with necessary building height on a 0.15 acre site at 3919 Pringle Street in the RS-1-7 Zone. *(DRS: Motion by Gatzke, 2nd Dahl: To recommend approval of the project plans as revised by applicant; with the following specific recommendations: (1.) support the height variance if the existing area that is over the height limitation is removed; (2.) support the FAR variance if necessary to allow enclosure of crawl space below family room addition, and there will not*

be a "pole structure." (3.)landscaping be placed on the outside front wall of the of the dining room addition and to the east side of the garage to obscure the mass of blank wall and roof, passed 6-0-1) (7:20 p.m.)

VI. Action Items: Non-Project: (7:40 p.m.)

1. UPTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE: -- Recommendation of Bylaws/Rules Subcommittee Chair Don Liddell, and board member Jim Mellos, that in conformance with City Council Policy 600-24, Uptown Planners resolve to be a "committee of the whole" to act as the Uptown Community Plan Update Advisory Committee. Such committee of the whole shall closely work with local community plan update committees, and other stakeholders, in each of the six constituent communities of Uptown, as identified on pages 86/87 of the Uptown Community Plan. (*see attachment "A"*)

2. UPTOWN COMMUNITY PARKING DISTRICT REORGANIZATION: The Public Facilities Subcommittee made the following recommendation: (*Motion by Wilson, second by Hyde, passed 5-0.*) **(8:15 p.m.)**

(1.) That a new board be appointed for the Uptown Community Parking District by City Council Districts Two and Three; each City Councilmember appointing members from their respective districts. Appointees may include existing board members; individual should serve two years terms, subject to reappointment;

(2.) The City Council should not renew the contract with Uptown Partnership, Inc. to administer the Uptown Community Parking District. Instead a voluntary advisory board should be established under direct supervision of the city, similar to that which exists in other communities, such as Pacific Beach.

(3.) The revenue of the Uptown Community Parking District should be used primarily to fund needed public facilities; with a goal of limiting operating and administrative costs to approximately 10%. The projects funded should primarily be parking and mobility related, as required by City Council Policy 100-18.

(4.) Parking meter revenue should be used to fund public facilities in the Uptown community in which it is generated; whether Hillcrest, Mission Hills, Medical Complex, Middletown or Bankers Hill/Park West.

3. WEST LEWIS STREET MINI-PARK APPEAL: Public Facilities Subcommittee Recommendation: Adopt the consensus letter of five community members in support of an alternative design and expenditure cap for West Lewis Street Mini-Park project. (*Motion by Hyde, second by O'Dea, passed 5-0.*) (*see attachment "B"*) **(8:35 p.m.)**

VII. Board Member Recommendation: Action Item: (8:45 p.m.)

1. David Gatzke: Proposed written check-list of documents, renditions, etc., that project applicants should be requested to provide Uptown Planners.
2. Janet O'Dea: Amendment to Uptown Planners standard condition regarding sidewalk scoring.

VIII. Adjournment. (9:00 p.m.)

IX. NOTICE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Design Review Subcommittee Next Meeting; July 21, 2009, at 5:00 p. m.; at Swedenborgian Church, 4144 Campus Avenue, in University Heights

Historic Resources Subcommittee: Next meeting: June 9, 2009, at 3:00 p.m., at University Heights CDC, University Heights, 4452 Park Blvd., University Heights.

Public Facilities Subcommittee: – Next meeting; June 18, 2009, at 3:00 p.m., at Café Bassam, 3088 Fifth Avenue, in Bankers Hill/ Park West.

Uptown Planners: Next meeting: August 4, 2009, at 6:00 p. m., at the Joyce Beers Community Center, Hillcrest.

Note: All times listed are estimates only: Anyone who requires an alternative format of this agenda or has special access needs, please contact (619) 835-9501 at least three days prior to the meeting. For more information on meeting times or issues before Uptown Planners, contact Leo Wilson, Chair, at (619) 231-4495 or at leo.wikstrom@sbcglobal.net . Correspondence may be sent to 1010 University Ave, Box 1781, San Diego, CA 92103 Uptown Planners is the City's recognized advisory community planning group for the Uptown Community Planning Area.

Visit our website at www.uptownplanners.org for meeting agendas and other information

Attachment A

MEMORANDUM FROM DON LIDDELL, BYLAWS/ RULES SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR

At the last Uptown Planners meeting on April 7, 2009, I recommended that Uptown Planners consider establishing an *ad hoc* "Community Plan Update Advisory Subcommittee" as the best way to facilitate its collaboration with the City, affected stakeholder groups, and members of the Uptown community in the Community Plan Update process. In order to (i) minimize layers of bureaucracy and confusion, and (ii) promote effective community outreach and discussion. The newly formed Advisory Subcommittee should exist for the duration of the Community Plan Update process, functioning as an Uptown Planners "committee of the whole". The Advisory Subcommittee would consist of all of the elected members of Uptown Planners, and would obviate the need for any form separate an advisory committee established by the City. To support the recommended approach, this memorandum reviews (i) the draft Community Plan Update Manuals as it currently is propose for adoption, (ii) the City of San Diego's Policy on the roles and responsibilities of community planning groups, (iii) the Uptown Planner Bylaws – all in the context of the requirements of Brown Act and the over arching goals and objectives of San Diego's General Plan

I. BACKGROUND

An invitation to an initial public meeting to discuss the Community Plan update process with City staff that was sent to the Uptown, North Park, and Golden Hill community planning groups on January 28, 2009, stated that the agenda would include "the planning framework established by the City's new General Plan, and public involvement in the process by the existing community planning groups, as well as stakeholder committees formed for this purpose. These stakeholder committees will provide the opportunity for other interested members of the community to be formally involved in the process".

At the initial public meeting, there was no mention of San Diego's City Council Policy No. 600-24, which provides that community planning groups, such as Uptown Planners, "have been

formed and recognized by the City Council to make recommendations to the City Council, Planning Commission, City staff, and other governmental agencies on land use matters, *specifically, concerning the preparation of, adoption of, implementation of, or amendment to, the General Plan or a land use plan when a plan relates to each recognized community planning group's planning area boundaries* “. Council Policy 600-24 also states that the City does not direct or recommend the election of specified individual planning group members, nor does the City appoint members to planning groups, or recommend removal of individual members of a planning group."

The Uptown Planners Bylaws, adopted pursuant to City Council Policy No, 600-24, provide, at Article VI, that "It is the duty of the Uptown Planners to cooperatively work with the City throughout the planning process, including, but not limited to, the formation of long-range community goals, objectives and proposals or the revision thereto for inclusion in a General or Community Plan.". Article VI of the Bylaws also provide that "Uptown Planners may establish standing and *ad hoc* subcommittees when their operation contributes to more effective discussions at regular Uptown Planners meetings. In addition, the Bylaws require that any duly formed standing or *ad hoc* committees must consist of a majority of members that are elected members of Uptown Planners. Apart from the Brown Act and City Council policy, the Bylaws place no other procedural restrictions or requirements on formation of subcommittees. Like the Uptown Planners themselves, their meetings are conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order.

II. DRAFT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE MANUAL

Following the initial public meeting, a Memorandum transmitting a “Final Draft of a Community Plan Preparation Manual” to San Diego’s Community Planners Committee on March 17, 2009, says that "Planning staff manages the community plan update process and the recognized community planning groups serve as **the** major partner in the process." It goes on to say, however, that "At this time, the [City Planning & Community Investment] department is unable to support Community Planning Group (CPG) “veto” rights over non-CPG seats on the Community Plan Update Advisory Committees. Community Plan Update Advisory Committee seats are comprised of a CPG majority with additional seats reserved for other interested community persons. The CPG may provide input on the composition of the CPUAC seats. The non-CPG seats will be selected by either a lottery monitored by CPCI or by council member appointment."

The Final Draft of the Community Plan Preparation Manual was prepared by the City in accordance with guidance provided by the California State Office of Planning and Research 2009 General Plan Guidelines. There may be other sources of authority for its contents, but none are cited in the draft or the transmittal Memorandum. The draft says that “To ensure timely participation by the public and planning group a Community Plan Update Advisory Committee should be formed. This committee may be a subcommittee of the community planning group or formed as a separate committee by the City in consultation with the CPG. This committee will focus solely on the plan update and will meet regularly in a formal public setting where the appropriate time can be committed to the update and community input is encouraged. This committee is subject to the Brown Act meeting requirements and as a subcommittee of the planning group it is subject to the planning group’s bylaws and Council Policy 600-24. (page 10).

The draft Manual states further “There is no single approach to public participation that fits all events or communities. All updates will have a Community Plan Update Advisory Committee that will be tasked with meeting regularly and reviewing all aspects of the plan

update. The Community Plan Update Advisory Committee is responsible for convening the public discussion on the update and may be a newly formed group, a subcommittee of the community planning group, or other advisory body depending on the needs of the community.” The draft Manual presents two suggested alternative approaches Uptown Planners to chose from: “A Community Plan Update Advisory Committee may be established as a subcommittee of the planning group or the planning group may have representatives on a separately established committee.”

The draft Manual says: “Once the plan update begins and Planning staff has identified all the stakeholders involved, *the community planning group will form a Community Plan Update Advisory Committee.*”[Emphasis added] Contrary to the requirements of Council Policy 600-24 and the Uptown Planners Bylaws, the draft Manual then purports to dictate the appointment of a category of members of a subcommittee of Uptown Planners: “The Community Plan Update Advisory Committee will need to have balanced representation and include both elected members of the community planning group as well as non-members who wish to participate in the plan update.”

III. CONCLUSION

Uptown Planners should establish a committee of the whole to act as an advisory group to the City as and by itself, rather than cede its legitimate authority and responsibilities to a body that has no legal standing. As described in Roberts Rules of Order: “When an assembly has to consider a subject which it does not wish to refer to a committee, and yet where the subject matter is not well digested and put into proper form for its definite action, or when, for any other reason, it is desirable for the assembly to consider a subject with all the freedom of an ordinary committee, it is the practice to refer the matter to the “Committee of the Whole.” The committee of the whole is a very common practice, used to facilitate discussion and streamline administrative procedures that is ideally suited to serve the functions contemplated by the draft Community Plan Update Manual. The San Diego City Council, of course, routinely sits as the committee of the whole to facilitate discussion in accordance with the Permanent Rules of Council and report recommend action to the Council sitting itself. There is simply no good reason to ignore a traditional, well understood, and very workable committee of the whole procedure in order to embrace an advisory committee approach to the Community Planning process that is untried and likely to produce an unintended consequence – chaos.

Attachment B

CONSENSUS LETTER RE: WEST LEWIS STREET MINI-PARK

Councilmember Kevin Faulconer
Attn: Stephen Puetz

Re: West Lewis Mini Park Project

Dear Mr. Puetz:

Leaders of Mission Hills Heritage, the Mission Hills Town Council, Uptown Planners and residents who were originally involved with the design of this project recently met and concur with the following goals for this project:

1. The design should be “softened” and made more organic to fit better within the natural setting of the adjacent canyon;
2. No more than \$450,000 of DIF funds should be spent on Phase I of this project, and no DIF funds should be allocated to Phase II of this project.

In order to accomplish these goals, we propose the following design modifications, which we feel are within “substantial conformance” with the existing approval for the project, which can be accomplished through changes to the construction drawings, and if necessary by sub-phasing of the project:

- Remove the four (4) northernmost corten steel raised planters with small trees.
- Remove approximately 70%-80% of the boulders with only a few left for seating.
- Increase native/drought tolerant plantings as necessary to soften the park.
- Delete the concrete grid.
- Reduce the size of the “accent paver” area and substitute a more organic appearing material.
- Retain the interpretive sign/kiosk and walkway.
- Retain the public art as budget permits.

We will ask our constituent groups to consider approving these changes. We urge Councilmember Faulconer to assist us with convincing the Department of Parks and Recreation to agree to the changes in advance of the hearing on the pending appeal to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,
Barry Hager
Katherine Jones
Leo Wilson
John Lomac
James Gates