



## Stakeholder Committee Meeting #11

May 13, 2009

# SUMMARY

### ATTENDEES

*Stakeholder Committee members present:*

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Matt Carr	Community Org.	Mary Alvarado	Res. Tenant
Carlos Castaneda	Community Org.	Ana Nayeli Castañeda	Res. Tenant
Erika Cordero	Community Org.	Antonia Garcia	Res. Tenant
Georgette Gomez	Community Org.	Norene Riveroll	Res. Tenant
Jennette Lawrence	Community Org.	Hilda Valenzuela	Res. Tenant
Rachael Ortiz	Community Org.	Clifford Arellano	Business Owner
Ramon Chunky Sanchez	Community Org.	David Duea	Business Owner
Diego Aguilera	Res. Property Owner	Rudolph Pimentel	Business Owner
Isabel Betty Aguilera	Res. Property Owner	Michael Poutre	Business Owner
John Alvarado	Res. Property Owner	Shaun Halvax	Industry
Maribel Arellano	Non-Res. Property Owner	Karl Johnson	Industry
Albert Duenas	Non-Res. Property Owner	Lee Wilson	Industry
Evelyn Ruth Mitchell	Non Res. Prop. Owner		

*Ex-Officio members present:*

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Paul Brown	Port District	Reynaldo Pisano	SESDPG
Connery Cepeda	Caltrans		

*Alternate members present/excused/not excused:*

NAME	SEAT	
Ruben Andrews	Business Owner	Excused
Kim Austin	Business Owner	Present
Ron Beauloye Jr.	Business Owner	Present
Emily Monahan	Business Owner	Present
Patricia Bird Chavez	Res. Tenant	Present
Axelia Cordero	Res. Tenant	Present
Patricia Cuevas	Res. Tenant	Present
Maria Martinez	Res. Tenant	Present
Alex Alemany	Non-Res. Property Owner	Present
Robert Leif	Non-Res. Property Owner	Not Excused
Jerry Gray	Industry Rep.	Present
Ron Halik	Industry Rep.	Not Excused
Isidro Mendoza	Property Owner	Present

## INTRODUCTION

On May 13, 2009, members of the Stakeholders Committee (Committee) of the Barrio Logan Community Plan Update process convened for their 11th meeting. The purpose of the meeting was: (a.) to review the summary of Meeting #10; (b.) to learn more about and discuss previously conforming uses; (c.) to review land uses both new and previously introduced; (d.) to view and discuss a Preliminary Concept Map, along with its associated sub-area Alternatives; (e.) to hear Stakeholder Committee recommendations on land use for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) project; (f.) and to discuss next steps in the Community Plan Update process.

## MEETING FORMAT

The 11th Committee meeting occurred on May 13, 2009 from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Barrio Logan Plan Update Meeting Room located at 1625 Newton Avenue in San Diego. In addition to the 39 attending Committee members, approximately 45 community members attended the meeting. Upon entering the meeting facility, Committee and community members signed-in and received the following documents.

- Agenda
- Meeting #10 Summary Report
- Annotated Preliminary Concept Map

- Concept Map Alternatives - Main Street
- Concept Map Alternatives - Harbor Drive
- Previously Conforming Uses Fact Sheet

Comment cards were also made available.

All meeting handouts, presentation materials and displays included English and Spanish languages. The proceedings included simultaneous language translation from English to Spanish using headset equipment. Professional translators provided this service.

Committee and community members provided comments and questions during the facilitated discussion. Andy Pendoley of MIG and Alberto Romero of the City of San Diego recorded attendees' comments and questions in English and Spanish languages on a large wallgraphic paper at the front of the room, which is attached as a photo-reduced copy at the end of this summary report.

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Lara Gates, Project Manager with the City of San Diego welcomed everyone and then introduced Esmeralda García of MIG, Inc., Project Manager for the consultant team. Ms. García then provided an overview of the agenda and led a round of self-introductions with the Committee members.

### **Review of Meeting #10 Summary Report**

Ms. García led the audience through a review of the previous meeting's summary, and individuals, both on the committee and the public, were able to provide comments or changes to the document by marking their own agenda and handing them in to the City staff. There were no comments from the committee or general public.

### **Information Items – Previously Conforming Uses**

Ms. García reminded the group that there were several questions raised regarding previously conforming uses at prior meetings, and that the team is now following up on these. She introduced Dan Joyce, Land Development Code Planner for the City of San Diego. Mr. Joyce provided clarification regarding City of San Diego regulations around the topic of non-conforming uses.

Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions on each topic. Planning Team responses follow questions in *italics*.

- Handout is not very readable for community members. –*City worked to simplify as much as possible. Will try to simplify further.*
- How do rules apply to a mixed-use property where one of the properties is vacant for two years? –*Would need to know what the underlying zone allowed.*
- Can the use be kept if you improve your property (put up walls or remove a building)? –*Yes, if you spend less than 50% of the market value of the property.*

- Is there a difference between adding a second story to your unit and putting another building on the same parcel? –*Many of the properties here are 25 feet in width 140 deep and if you go by the offset available now your property would be very small. If the building is previously conforming you can do up to the maximum that the new plan allows, add height to the front or the back and make sure you don't take more than 50 % of the walls down. You can also get a neighborhood development permit and then you can deviate 20% of the required setbacks.*
- If a zone becomes residential and there are existing businesses in the area, how would the community come to know if changes are being proposed for those businesses? –*In the future, if more than 50% of the value is being spent, a neighborhood development permit is required. When someone gets a neighborhood development permit a notice is sent by mail to all properties 300 feet around it. If less than 50% is being spent, this process is not required.*

### Amortization Schedule

- Could amortization schedules be clarified? –*This is not in the purview of the LDC planner, but rather the City Attorney's office. If it were something the community wanted to consider, schedules could be considered later in the plan update process.*
- Are schedules planned yet? – *No.*
- If you have an amortization schedule, do you have to in addition to setting the time till they get their value, pay them to relocate? –*This is again something the City Attorney's office would work out with our Real Estate Assets Department. It is not part of the code.*
- If this is an income property and the tenant has a lease with multiple renewal options or a long term lease, what would be done for the tenant if the amortization occurred before the end of the lease term? –*That is something the Real Estate Assets Department and City Attorney's office would deal with. However the idea of the schedule is that it has to be over a significant amount of time to realize the property value; most likely ten or fifteen years.*
- An amortization schedule on a scale of 10 to 15 years is neither specific nor helpful. – *This is again something the Real Estate Assets Department and City Attorney's office would deal with. The only time that will come into effect is if the plan is written in such a manner that they place something in the code that says these businesses which are previously conforming in this location must relocate. In that case, this information has to become available before the plan can be adopted.*
- Is the city currently contemplating any amortization schedules at this time? –*The City has not discussed this. If the Committee would like to discuss this we can put it on a future agenda.*

### Land Use Overview

Ms. Gates next introduced Vicki Estrada of Estrada Land Planning to present on the land use classifications and zoning relevant to the up-coming discussion of the Preliminary Concept Map. Ms. Estrada went over each land use classification along with basic zoning details and representative images. Land uses covered in the presentation included designations previously used, as well as ones that had been recently added.

Ms. García next went over the Preliminary Concept Map, a map that consolidates previously introduced Alternatives maps into a single map, but for two sub-areas that have various alternatives intended to represent the diversity of stakeholder perspectives in these areas. Ms. García explained that with Stakeholder Committee member agreement, this map could potentially be taken forward for EIR analysis, with results used to make an informed decision regarding the final land use plan. Ms. García then facilitated a discussion around the Preliminary Concept Map.

Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions on each topic. Planning Team responses follow questions in *italics*.

### *General*

- Create a balance between affordable and market rate housing
- Create more affordable housing for very low income people that already live here. –*Reality of finding sufficient public revenue to subsidize these projects at such a low rate makes this difficult.*
- Only providing affordable housing is not realistic in Barrio Logan. How will it be financed? – *Financing will be analyzed later.*
- The redevelopment area has a 50 foot limit and the rest of the community has a 35 foot limit. Consider keeping that 35 foot limit throughout the rest of Barrio Logan.
- Is the City considering both parks shown on the map or is it one or the other?
- Create a park near Perkins Elementary
- I know a child who has beginning stage of asthma – personal stories such as this motivate us to participate and emphasize the need for less industry and a cleaner environment.
- Transition building heights down starting from I-5 to Harbor Drive to preserve views.
- Do not allow Live-Work uses near the freeway due to negative health repercussions.
  - Keep Live-Work uses in this location. This will be an important part of keeping artists in the community.

### *Land Use and Zone Designations*

- Number of stories for residential? –*Generally, Low-Medium would be 3 stories; Medium-High: 4 stories, High: 4-6 stories. However, this depends on the setback and building mass. We have shown examples of different types of buildings and maximum heights because some developers may be able to achieve a certain number of stories with a building that does not look massive.*
- Keep the base height for residential at 3 stories and create a bonus for affordable housing.
- IBT is a use designation. Each community plan may limit the height of the use.
- Tailor a Barrio-appropriate IBT designation to be placed in area north of Main to benefit the maritime industry be compatible with the community.

### *Neighborhood Village*

- What is Neighborhood Village?

- – *Neighborhood Village is not a zone but a land use designation from the General Plan intended to encourage walkability, flexible uses, and public amenities.*
- *Buildings within the Neighborhood Village designation would have the option of including mixed-use, but would not be required.*
- *Additionally, development here would be subject to higher criterion and requirements around public amenities like art, streetscape and landscaping.*
- *Also, development within the Neighborhood Village designation has more access to regional funding for transit and pedestrian enhancements from SANDAG and other sources.*
- Tailor the Neighborhood Village designation to include a statement against gentrification and for low-income housing.
- Provide bonuses for environmental or sustainability benefits
- Neighborhood Village land use is not very clear –how is it that it can encompass La Entrada which is strictly residential, and Logan Avenue which is designated as mixed use?
- Why is the City considering Neighborhood Village when the majority of uses are commercial industrial? Is it because the City wants to extend the East Village into Barrio Logan? –*The area being considered for Neighborhood Village was highly residential in the past.*
- Can you provide examples from San Diego of what a Neighborhood Village designation might look like? –*The goal is to encourage the walkability and mix of uses that might be found in older neighborhoods where there was a mixture of housing small business retail and it was very walkable. Examples (though these are still at a larger scale than what is envisioned in Barrio Logan) include neighborhoods around Park and Adams and North Park and some portions of San Ysidro and Hillcrest.*

Ms. Estrada presented the Concept Map Alternatives for Main Street and Harbor Drive and facilitated a discussion with the Stakeholder committee and members of the public. The following is a summary of the key discussion points.

#### Concept Map Alternatives - Main Street Main/Newton/I-5

- General
  - Consider other options on Boston besides residential
  - Why is EHC tolerant of residential near the freeway on Boston but not anywhere else? –*EHC is tolerating residential on Boston because of the historical context of this area and because it would be the only remaining single dwelling area in Barrio Logan.*
  - Check previous access study to A-Z Recycling site (32nd and Main Streets)
- Alternative 1
  - Not ideal for retailers – no radius for a customer base and disconnect from other corridors
  - Consider a one-way street to mitigate Port traffic from the I-5 freeway

- Alternative 2
  - IBT is not desirable here because its placement adjacent to residential make it incompatible and inconsistent with community desires
- Alternative 3
  - While a Commercial designation would not create much change, an Office designation would eliminate delivery truck nuisances.
  - Restrict office height to 2-stories
  - Clarify office heights to address concerns regarding sunlight access

Concept Map Alternatives – Harbor Drive  
Coronado/Harbor/28<sup>th</sup>

- General
  - Need clarification regarding the differences between IBT and Community Commercial. Uses allowed seem similar.
- Alternative 1
  - IBT is a City-imposed land use designation; this is why the community is against it. Additionally, this land use would create incompatible uses.
  - IBT is acceptable as long as light industrial would work here. This may be a good location for the existing maritime businesses that cater to the Port.
  - Provide data regarding how IBT would benefit the community
- Alternative 2
  - Friendlier alternative from resident perspective since it will not result in more trucks
  - Contains uses that the community both desires and does not desire

**Committee Recommendation on Land Use for EIR Project**

Ms. García requested Stakeholder Committee members to provide their recommendations regarding the Preliminary Concept Map and the alternatives in the two sub-area. After a facilitated discussion, members were asked to vote on the two sub-areas, and whether or not at least one of the Alternative options found at each represented their perspective. If members found that their perspective was not properly represented, they were asked to provide feedback as to how one of these alternatives might change to ensure their viewpoint was represented in the EIR analysis process.

Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions on each Alternative, and in general.

*California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Process – What should move forward for the EIR?*

- Can we add alternatives to be studied or is this the maximum? –*We need to first consider the highest impact scenario and then scale down from there.*
- The CEQA process will analyze different alternatives and create mitigation measures.
- Present the environmental impact data in a way that reflects the total real impact of the development project as projected instead of representing the data where it minimizes the total effect on the neighborhoods.

## Recommendations

### Three alternatives along Main Street

Ms. Garcia asked the Committee to vote on whether all three alternatives for the sub-area along Main Street should be studied in the environmental review process. The Committee voted 12 to 11 in favor of studying all three.

### Two alternatives along Harbor Drive and Main Street

Ms. Garcia asked the Committee to vote on whether the two alternatives for the sub-area along Harbor Drive should be studied in the environmental review process. The Committee voted 8 to 12 in opposition to studying the two alternatives.

### Preliminary Concept Map

Ms. Garcia asked the Committee to vote on whether the Preliminary Concept Map should be the baseline land use concept to be studied in the environmental review process. Eleven Committee members voted in favor of studying the Preliminary Concept.

Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions regarding the recommendations. Planning Team responses follow questions in *italics*.

- The Stakeholders Committee vote should be respected if we have a purpose. Will only the alternatives seen today be studied or is there a chance the City will bring forward new scenarios we have never seen before? *–What the City is hoping is that at least one scenario holds everyone’s view in at least one way. This will provide the technical information needed to make informed decisions.*
- Provide the maximum amount of data to the community and Stakeholder Committee. This will give credibility to the final decisions made.
- Make it clear that the majority vote to move forward with this land use scenario was by business and quasi-business, and was not supported by residents.

## Next Steps

Ms. Gates thanked everyone for their participation and Ms. García reminded everyone of the date for the next Stakeholder Committee meeting, scheduled for June 10, 2009 (Which has subsequently been postponed to a later date).

## Non-Agenda Public Comment

There were two members of the public who made comments.

- Need clarity on the IBT designation
- Present real impacts from the EIR data

## **CLOSE**

Ms. García closed the meeting by thanking Committee and community members for attending.

## **ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments submitted via comment cards. Comment cards submitted at past meetings are on file at the City of San Diego and are available for viewing during normal office hours. Please contact Lara Gates at 619-236-6006 to set up a time to view the actual cards.