

# GREATER GOLDEN HILL PLANNING COMMITTEE

November 13, 2013

6:30 PM

Balboa Park Golf Course Clubhouse, 2600 Golf Course Drive

[www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg](http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg)

**Call to Order** \*\*6:30

**Additions and/or Deletions to Agenda**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Governmental Reports** \*\*6:35 (Governmental Reports, Tabled Until January)

Community Police Officer – Kevin Vasquez {619.674.7268 or  
[kvasquez@pd.sandiego.gov](mailto:kvasquez@pd.sandiego.gov)}

39th Senate District – Chris Ward {619.645.3133 or [christopher.ward@sen.ca.gov](mailto:christopher.ward@sen.ca.gov)}

53rd Congressional District – Gavin Deeb {619.280.5353 or  
[gavin.deeb@mail.house.gov](mailto:gavin.deeb@mail.house.gov)}

80<sup>th</sup> Assembly District – Aida Castaneda {619.338.8090 or [aida.castaneda@asm.ca.gov](mailto:aida.castaneda@asm.ca.gov)}

Council District 3 – Courtney Thomson {619.236.6633 or [cthomson@sandiego.gov](mailto:cthomson@sandiego.gov)}

City Planner – Bernard Turgeon {619.533.6575 or [bturgeon@sandiego.gov](mailto:bturgeon@sandiego.gov)}

**Non Agenda Public Comment** \*\*6:50

**Chair Report, Vice Chair Report** \*\*7:00 (Chair and Vice Chair Reports, Tabled Until January)

**Action Items** \*\*7:05

- **Elections:** New member election
- **Community Plan Update Draft:** Bernie Turgeon, Senior Planner. Committee to provide input on Draft Plan; Review, Edit, and Discuss Summary Document (attached)

**Information Items** \*\*7:30

**Consent Agenda** \*\*7:25

**Sub-Committee Updates**

Historic\* – Susan Bugbee {[bugbee@sandiego.edu](mailto:bugbee@sandiego.edu)}

**Adjournment** \*\*8:30

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

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

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

## Greater Golden Hill Community Plan Update Draft

Committee Comments – Summary Document

**Section 1.0: Introduction:** Brierton, Swarens, and Davis

Identify and plan for Very High Fire Sensitivity Zones (maps available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/services/brush/severityzones.shtml>), portions of South Park are included within the zone: The plan should limit dense construction in these areas, ensuring that new construction has fire truck turn around access as required by code, requiring fire safe zones in areas that connect habitable structures to open brush. Additionally, the plan should acknowledge Very High Fire Sensitivity Zones not only in

the introduction, but in Section 6 "Public Facilities, Services & Safety Element" and throughout the plan as a whole.

The plan should recognize that the 32nd and 34th Street Canyons are protected by Fish and Game (code section 2831 and City Council Resolution R-30253 [in 2007] as designated open space and habitat protected areas). (Page 9 of the draft erroneously states that the 32nd Street Canyon is not within Multiple Species Conservation.) This should also be reflected in the Recreation Element, 7.4, "Open Space Lands", page 18.

The General Plan Guiding Principles on page 3 of the draft should restate the following items from the prior plan:

- PRESERVE VIEW CORRIDORS (see page 37 of 1988 Plan)
- PRESERVE SINGLE FAMILY AND LOW DENSITY AREAS. The introduction of the prior plan specified different types of architecture In Greater Golden Hill & referenced "sensitivity to older established character, scale, design & topological features."
- PRESERVE COMMUNITY CHARACTER PRESERVE LANDSCAPE/STREETSCAPE

Some important information in the prior plan has been edited out. For example:

- The introduction to the prior plan included acreage, number of residents & number of dwelling units on #acres, & other land uses in the community.
- It also noted our excellent access to transportation systems. The issue of transportation access should be highlighted, based on our community's concern about too much traffic for the infrastructure in specified areas (as submitted to the City Planning Committee), the proposed elevated lane on Highway 94, and the proposed closure of certain freeway exits/on-ramps in our community. This is germane to the "City of Villages" strategy; particularly since page 10 of the draft states mixed use on 30th & Broadway is desirable...recall that GGHPC was divided on that issue, but the majority did not think that area was desirable for mixed-use commercial due to traffic issues (including the adjacent ramp closure).
- The historical connection to Spreckles in the introduction to the prior plan is worthy of continued inclusion.
- On page 7 of the draft, Overall community goals: the new plan should add, PRESERVING VIEW CORRIDORS
- On page 7 of the draft, General Plan Guiding Principles should include: PRESERVE AND PROTECT OPEN SPACE CANYONS, CANYON HABITATS, and HILLSIDES. The hillside and open space evaluation models on pages 163, 165, & 166 of the prior community plan should be reincorporated into this plan. Hillside review should apply to all open space canyon rim development, given the new laws passed to protect designated canyons.

Re "City of Villages Strategy": Language should point out affirmatively that the historic streetcar suburbs have naturally evolved successful, community serving, activity

nodes, as well as a variety of housing types/opportunities, and connectivity with adjacent communities such as Center City and North Park.

It is the generally "newer" parts of the community, developed during the "auto era" which suffers issues of connectivity, walkability, transit, services, etc. When these areas were built it was assumed that one would get in one's car and go to work, shop, etc.

Page 5: Paragraph 2: "built to capacity by 1930" In many ways this is in fact true.

Section 1.2: "Historic characteristics ...encourage development and redevelopment..." This treats "Golden Hill" like the "Goose which lays the golden egg" and puts our collective necks on the block. The plan goal has often been stated to conserve and enhance these features, rather than as seems to be suggested here, replace them because they are so well regarded.

Page 7: "Preserving historically and architecturally significant..., in districts and individually" Again, the restated goal has been to preserve and enhance these character defining features throughout the community; to this end one of the charrette findings was the recommendation to establish a "conservation zone" for the entire community plan area, to preserve these elements where historic designation might not be the appropriate tool.

Page 9: Paragraph 4: "Environmental review policies designed to avoid impacts..." To implement this goal, land use recommendations, especially in proposed historic districts, should be consistent with the goal to preserve and enhance character defining elements which would be considered significant under CEQA.

Identify sub-areas with Greater Golden Hill. Reference the sub-areas consistently throughout the plan.

**Section 2.0: Land Use Element:** Kroll, Brierton, Swarens, Davis, and Alvarez

Pertaining to Commercial Development, the Draft Plan inadequately addresses strip malls in the area. On the whole, strip malls should not be permitted in the plan moving forward. One primary issue is parking – if strip malls are allowed to continue, parking should only be permissible at the rear of the business. Further, any reconstruction and/or rebuilding of existing strip malls should trigger a retooling of their parking areas to the rear of the business. Additionally, the same parking requirements should apply not only to strip malls but also include singular businesses (for example: including – but not limited to: Millers Market, Food Bowl, Liquor Store at 30<sup>th</sup> & Grape, and Liquor Store at 30<sup>th</sup> & Juniper). Reconstruction and/or rebuilding of such existing businesses should also trigger a retooling of their parking areas to the rear. On upgrading store fronts, store fronts should face directly towards sidewalk areas.

The draft plan includes a photo of the signage at Jericho's market – although this particular sign is grandfathered in, it does not meet current code compliance requirements and/or standards – thus it should not be used to depict an area standard.

On page 9 of the draft, section 2.2-19 should be changed. There should be no development allowed for parcels within designated Open Space. Similarly, the "Public

Facilities, Services & Safety Element" of the Plan (Page 4 & 6 of draft, section 6.1-8) should address that replacement of the aging sewer infrastructure and development of a groundwater pumping facility adjacent to the 32nd Street Canyon in the 32nd Street Canyon must be subject to a CEQA review to determine the least intrusive possible approach to sensitive lands, habitat, and species. (See also, "Canyon Sewer Program" in "Conservation Element", page 9-10.)

Page 1, "Goals": "Historic character and scale retained within single family and low density neighborhoods..." This conflicts with stated goal of protecting character throughout the community, which has been a finding of every forum, meeting, charrette, etc., and a stated goal of the GGHCPG.

Page 5: 2.2-5: "...provide design guidelines...to single family neighborhoods..." see comment above; this is inconsistent with stated goals of the Plan update.

Page 6: Please note that significant employment opportunities should not be anticipated, nor would they be desired, generally within the residential community and community serving businesses; adjacent, transit linked Center City, Port area, etc., are, and should be, the focus for employment-centric land uses.

Paragraph 3: "...existing single family and duplex homes..." Add "bungalow courts, and early apartment buildings..."

Page 10: Does not seem to include existing successful nodes, such as 30th and Beech. Later, in Urban Design element, 30th & Beech does show up as a "Village" target.

The community's right to define for itself what "village" should be preserved, per the General Plan, this seems to get lost, and become just an excuse for "urban renewal".

2.1.1: What does it mean to say "decisions...should be inclusive of social equity and environmental justice considerations."?

21.1: (2nd one, same number of Page 4) I like the public health comment about noise and air pollution but needs to be discussed further.

Page 7: Delevan Street conversion to Residential supported by GGHPC. Plan written to support continued industrial uses and cites "adverse environmental effects from the adjacent freeway".

Page 10: Discussion of Neighborhood Centers doesn't mention 28th St Commercial or Beech Street. Other elements refer to these commercial areas.

Page 11 2.2-27: What does "restrict building intensities under the approach path to Lindbergh" mean?

Introduction: How is "appropriate distribution" defined, qualified, or implemented?

Commercial & Employment: The plan only specifies alcohol – include noise, lighting, or any other aggravator deemed unwanted/excessive to nearby residents.

### **Section 3.0 Mobility Element: Swarens & Baldwin**

Page 2: "considerations" -Sidewalks often lack width for multiple..."

Page 3: "encroachments..." As noted in the preface to this section, the basic infrastructure design is a "mobility asset"; it should not be targeted as a problem. It is also a character defining feature which may be considered significant under CEQA. Where this network has been compromised in various ways, these problems should be solved, rather than treating the "asset" as the problem. The plan discusses transit improvements and walkability in general terms. However, the plan suggests no immediate concrete ideas for how this would occur.

**Section 4.0 Urban Design Element: Swarens**

Page 5: Indicates 30th & Beech as a "Village" target; this does not seem to be consistent with the mapping in the Land Use element, page 10. Please see comments in section 2.0.

Page 12: section 4.2 P-UD-13: "Support construction of accessory units in low density residential neighborhoods" I believe we should discuss this recommendation further, and not base our recommendations on anecdotal data. This effectively doubles the density, and while it may enhance profit it may also greatly diminish value. This increase in density should be at least "discretionary" in the plan update, and clarified further as to what areas it would be applied.

4.3: P-UD-27 & P-UD-28: "continuous storefront" "built to the sidewalk" This would destroy the variety and texture the plan says its goal is to protect, and treats this very successful community as a "blank slate." It also threatens historic and potentially historic resources by encouraging their alteration or removal.

4.4: "traffic circles are appropriate for Golden Hill because they... are easy to implement" That is not sound reasoning; they may or may not be "appropriate", but their "ease" is no support of that.

P-UD-44: Pop outs should not be encouraged in areas identified as "historic" as infrastructure is a character defining feature of the fabric of these areas.

Section 4.5: Page 15: indicates the more appropriate answer to these issues, keeping the corner radius tight. Keeping street corners clear of a clutter, restrictions, and obstructions also promotes the stated goals, and should be included as a recommendation.

P-UD-39: Add sections

- Encouraging planting of street trees (consistent with later elements)
- Develop a historic tree palette, for historic districts and areas.

These are as important Urban Design/streetscape elements as they are for Conservation, etc, and the Plan should include them here (also).

P-UD-46: Please reference link with "Sherman Heights Revitalization Action Plan" design program. This is a City of San Diego policy document, and while this part of 25th street is not in the Plan boundaries, neither is the bay. Streetscape, especially trees and lighting, in this program were designed to coordinate with north of 94 efforts.

Gateways: P-UD-69: With some notable exceptions, are generally, and appropriately, used in primarily commercial areas. Use in GH should generally be

encouraged in those areas only. Suggested new recommendation- Encourage the reconstruction of the documented historic gateways at 28th and Ash, and other locations they can be documented to have been; these stone pillars with lighting are associated with the early development of the South Park area, and their return would enhance the historic identity of that community.

4.8: P-UD-72: Please add to text "designers" to enhance the pool of "artists", as architects and other designers may be the "artists" best suited to any particular project.

**Section 5.0 Economic Prosperity Element: Swarens**

Page 2: 5.1.2: Add "...while maintaining the vibrant diversity of uses which characterize these corridors".

**Section 6.0 Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element: Swarens**

Page 3: Paragraph 3: "Central Area Police substation is in..." Southeastern San Diego (Logan Heights/Sherman Heights) rather than in "Centre City", as stated.

Page 6: 6.1-9: (Re. undergrounding) add: provide oversight to insure preservation of aesthetics in replacement and repair of impacted infrastructure, especially on historic properties, and historic public improvements (e.g. sidewalks, curbs, hardscape, etc.)

**Section 7.0 Recreation Element: Brierton, Swarens, Burkart, & Baldwin**

7.1.8--This element should highlight the importance of a safe, multimodal sidewalk connecting the Recreation Center and 28th Street along Golf Course Drive, plus a sidewalk along 26th Street for safe access to Balboa Park.

Page 16: Goals: "...mature trees...representing the Victorian era" should be corrected to reflect the reality of the horticultural heritage of the park. "...reflecting the 19th and 20th century..." "Representing the late Victorian and early 20th century..." or something similar.

Section 7: Page 7 & 12 [Table RE 7-1] - does not represent committee site ranking made at the June 26th, 2013 meeting. The following sites were ranked high by the committee:

- Site 1 – Pocket park along F St.
- Site 2 – SR94 freeway cap and park
- Site 5c – “Ring of Green” that borders the I-5 at 19th St. from Broadway to E St
- Site 6 - Community Garden in Balboa Park adjoining Russ Blvd. between 24th and 25th streets.
- Site 9 - Seven lots along 32nd St. between Broadway and C and along Broadway from C St. east towards 32nd St totaling 3,81 acres and privately owned
- Site 13 - Parcels adjacent to 29th St. between B and C streets, an area of 1.59 acres

Include calculations of residents and amount of park space. Highlighting this disparity in the plan ensures that should money become available these projects become more likely.

**Section 8.0 Conservation Element: Brierton & Swarens**

Add "Identification & protection of species (animals, birds, plants)" policy (pg.1)

Page 4: 8.1.1: The subject of "repositioned" needs to be addressed with more attention. The concept should definitely not be co-equal in the stated goal. Please reference "Secretary of Interior Standards" ("The Standards") and local policies and ordinances (which incorporate the Standards). The "Landmark" significance of resources is most often tied to site, and relocation is addressed under specific criteria in the Standards.

8.1.9: Add - develop survey and research based Historic (street tree) palette for Historic Districts and areas (much of this ground work has already been done). Recognize/acknowledge that the "Greenest" building is often the one already built, energy and other resources, including those for removal and replacement suggest a cost benefit which should encourage preservation, especially in a community defined by its historic built environment.

**Section 9.0 Noise Element: Alvarez**

In addition to late night and early morning disturbances – the plan needs to include consideration of how many times per week the disturbances occur and its duration.

Clearly acknowledge the right of “quiet enjoyment”.

9.3: This should not just apply to “new or retrofitted” buildings – extend the requirements for changes in use that are likely to cause noise disturbances to nearby residents.

**Section 10.0 Historic Preservation Element: Brierton**

The proposed districts submitted by GGHPC should be adopted and specifically referenced.

**Section 11.0 Implementation**

**Section 12.0 Appendix**