



## **NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**AGENDA: August 18, 2009 – 6:30 PM**

<http://www.northparkplanning.org>

**2901 NORTH PARK WAY, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR**

**Mailing address: 3939 ARIZONA ST., SAN DIEGO, CA 92104**

- I. Parliamentary Items (6:30 p.m.)**
- A. Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions
    - 1. Report on NPPC Board Attendance
  - B. Modifications to & Adoption of the August 18, 2009 Agenda
  - C. Urgent non-agenda action items. Items may be initiated by a NPPC board member and added to the agenda by a 2/3 vote of committee in attendance.
  - D. Chair's Report/CPC
    - 1. Community Plan Manual subcommittee (CPC). 1 & 2 outstanding
    - 2. Substantial Conformance Review
    - 3. Increased CPG Appeal Period
  - E. Approval of Previous Minutes: July 21, 2009
  - F. Treasurer's Report – Steve Chipp
  - G. Announcements –
    - 1. Community Plan – **Committee of the Whole 8/19 CANCELLED**
  - H. Planner's Report - Marlon Pangilinan, 619.235.5293; [mpangilinan@sandiego.gov](mailto:mpangilinan@sandiego.gov)
- II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each)** Please fill out a Public Comment Sheet and give to Secretary prior to the meeting.
- III. Elected Official Reports (2 Minutes Each) (7:00 p.m.)**
- A. Nick Norvell, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congressional District 53
  - B. Jason Weisz, Hon. Christine Kehoe, CA State Senate District 39
  - C. Kirsten Clemons, Hon. Lori Saldana, State Assembly District 76
  - D. Travis Knowles, Hon. Todd Gloria, City Councilmember District 3
- IV. Consent Agenda: (7:10p.m.) UD/PR** August 3, 2009 CANCELLED. **PF/PA** August 6, 2009  
**Members Present:** Sal Arechiga, Rene Vidales, Lynn Elliott, Ernie Bonn, Liz Studebaker.
- A. **No Consent Items**
- V. Action Items: (7:15)**
- A. **Discussion/recommendation of Community Plan advisory stakeholder categories.**
- VI. Information Items:**
- A. **Demolition letter for LU & H "History Day", Sept. 23 (7:45 p.m.)**
  - B. **Update on North Park post office – Nick Norvell**
  - C. **Community Plan Update: (8:00 p.m.)**
- VII. Urgent Non-Agenda Action Items** – Items may be initiated by a member and added to the Agenda by a 2/3 vote of the Committee. (8:10 p.m.)
- VIII. Subcommittee Reports (5 Minutes Maximum per Report) (8:05 p.m.)**
- A. **Urban Design/Project Review**, Keoni Rosa, Robert Barry – NP Adult Community Center, 6:00pm 1st Monday. Next meeting August 31, 2009

- B. Public Facilities/Public Art**, Rene Vidales, Sal Arechiga -NPMS, 3076 University Ave, 6:30 pm, 1st Thursday. Next meeting September 3, 2009
- C. Community Plan - Committee of the Whole** – NP Adult Community Center, 6:00pm 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday. Next meeting September 16, 2009
- D. Policy/Community Relations**. Meetings TBD as needed.

**IX. Liaisons Reports** (2 Minutes Maximum per Report). (8:10 p.m.)

- A.** Alcohol and Entertainment Working Group – Vicki Granowitz
- B.** Balboa Park Committee – Rob Steppke
- C.** Project Area Committee - Judi O’Boyle
- D.** Public Safety & Neighborhood Services - Stephen Whitburn
- E.** Maintenance Assessment District – Rob Steppke
- F.** North Park Parking Management Working Group - Rene Vidales
- G.** NP Parking Garage/Art Selection Working Group - Keoni Rosa/Judi O’Boyle
- H.** North Park Main Street - Liz Studebaker

**X. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items**

**XI. Next Meeting Date: September 15, 2009**

**XII. Adjournment** (8:25 p.m.)

**\*\*Times are estimates only.**

- This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in alternative format, or request a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting, call: (619) 236-6405.
  - To Contact the Chair of NPPC, call Rob Steppke at (619) 297-2012 or [arebeestep@netzero.net](mailto:arebeestep@netzero.net)
  - To Contact Urban Design/ Project Review, call Keoni Rosa at (619) 294-9018 or [kr@keonirosa.com](mailto:kr@keonirosa.com)
- BYLAWS REQUIRE THAT YOU CONTACT THE CHAIR IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND THE MEETING:**

**NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Draft Minutes: July 21, 2009 – 6:30 PM**  
<http://www.northparkplanning.org>  
**2901 NORTH PARK WAY, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR**  
**Mailing address: 3939 ARIZONA ST., SAN DIEGO, CA 92104**

**I. Called to order:** 6:34 p.m.

**II. Members in attendance (15):** Sal Arechiga, Robert Barry, Kitty Callen, Steve Chipp, Cheryl Dye, Lynn Elliott, Vicki Granowitz, Keoni Rosa, Christy Scannell, Ryan Silva, Rob Steppke, Liz Studebaker, Rene Vidales, Stephen Whitburn. (Judi O'Boyle arrived at 7 p.m.)

**III. Report on NPPC Board Attendance.**

**IV. Adoption of the July 21, 2009 Agenda. 14-0-0.** Modified to move Kirsten Clemons' report.

**V. Elected Official Report:** Kirsten Clemons, Hon. Lori Saldaña, State Assembly District 76. Budget agreed on previous night; \$4 billion borrowing from local governments; state parks will remain open; AB 694, sponsored by Saldaña, will close loophole that allowed Navy to sue city re: Navy Broadway complex.

**VI. Chair's Report**

- A. Indemnification status was approved by City Council and extends to subcommittees.
- B. Community Plan Manual subcommittee. 1 & 2 outstanding; goes to CPC July 28.
- C. State extended DSD permit period by one year and city added a year to assist builders.
- D. FBA/DIF amendment allows DIF fees to be delayed until project has substantial completion.
- E. DSD inspection fees will be going up 50 percent.
- F. Ryan Silva is new MAD representative. Robert Barry is new Urban Design/Project Review subcommittee vice-chair.

**VII. Approval of Previous Minutes: June 16, 2009. Granowitz/Whitburn. 13-0-1.** (Silva abstained.)

**VIII. Treasurer's Report:** \$571.72 as of 6/30/09.

**IX. Announcements**

A. The last two NPCA Bird Park Concerts are July 25 and Aug. 8.

**X. Planner's Report - Marlon Pangilinan.**

A. The Community Plan Update contracts were approved by the City Council for North Park. Waiting on mayor to sign and then work will start.

**XI. Non Agenda Public Comment**

- A. JD Abercrombie: Sandra Morgan is new liaison between University Heights and North Park planning groups, attending both meetings.
- B. Dawn Griffin: Davenport Supper Club. Project at 3067 University Avenue. Will be doing public meetings so people can voice opinions about project.
- C. Charles Kaehler: Concerns about St. Augustine High School CUP. Lives less than a block from SAHS. Feels city hasn't heard residents about expansion, size of building, and parking. Added as Information Item.
- D. Joyce Summer, CCDC. Permanent homeless facility – committee has met twice; will have company chosen by September but not in time for winter shelter. Padres opening Park in the Park for free. Construction on cruise ship terminal begins this month. City working on pedicab ordinance.
- E. Jeff Wergiles, University Heights Community Association. Says there was no consensus on the Community Housing Works project. Many were there who supported it. Stick by decision and don't reopen it.

**XII. Elected Official Reports**

- A. Nick Norvell, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congressional District 53. House scheduled to vote July 21 on voter reform bill that Davis sponsored; \$1.9 million for crime fighting in SD; voted in favor of cap on trade bill and the house health care reform bill.
- B. Steve Hill, Hon. Todd Gloria, City Councilmember District 3. Benefits of DSD permit extensions; city staff determined DIF fee deferral won't have impact on amount collected or city's ability to use it; DSD fee proposal will be heard at next LU&H, which Gloria chairs; next Gloria coffee at Alchemy, Aug. 1.

**XIII. Consent Agenda**

- A. **Jefferson Elementary Project #161614.** Motion: Approve use of chain link fencing, and add alternate bid for aluminum fencing at district option. UD/PR: Steppke/Elliott, 9-0-0.
- B. **3639 Herman Ave. Project #164625.** Motion: To approve as presented including site development to allow setbacks and FAR deviations and to include carriage style garage doors. UD/PR: O'Boyle/Carlson, 9-0-0.  
**MOTION: Approve consent agenda. Elliott. 15-0-0.**

#### **XIV. Action Items**

- A. **Community Plan subcommittee.** Discussion of following Uptown Planners' model of Committee of the Whole (NPPC would serve as COTW) rather than selecting stakeholders. NPPC members feel they represent the diversity of geography, interests, and skills to most benefit the Plan subcommittee's work. The city will select a non-voting advisory committee to meet with NPPC. The city will seek NPPC's advice for the advisory committee but the city has final approval on who is appointed. Both committees will attend Plan meetings with a facilitator. **MOTION: To approve the NPPC as a Committee of the Whole that forms the voting Community Plan Update Advisory Committee. The mayor will form a non-voting stakeholder committee. Granowitz/O'Boyle. 15-0-0.**
- B. **North Park Christian Fellowship donation.** Steppke recommends a \$100 annual donation to assist with air conditioning in the NPPC meeting room. **MOTION: To donate \$100 to North Park Christian Fellowship. Rosa/Callen. 15-0-0.**

#### **XV. Information Items**

- A. **NPPC website.** Send all items for website to Steppke and he will send for posting all at once to save money. Subcommittees need to send by four days before Urban Design/Project Review meets.
- B. **Community Plan Update.** First meeting scheduled for Aug. 19, North Park Adult Center, 6-8 p.m., with monthly meetings following every third Wednesday.
- C. **St. Augustine High School.** Resident Charles Kaehler says there are inconsistencies between the NPPC-approved plans for the school's building project and the current plans approved by the city, especially in parking. Chipp says DSD determined the current plan. He says the CUP calls for 145 spaces and there are 145 spaces. Kaehler says the understanding among residents is there was to be additional parking as mitigation. Steppke declines to send the issue to subcommittee, instead suggesting Kaehler work with Marlon Pangilinan on his concerns.

#### **XVI. Subcommittee Reports**

- A. **Urban Design/Project Review,** Rosa/Silva. Discussed both consent items. Next meeting: August 3, 2009.
- B. **Public Facilities/Public Art,** Vidales/Archiga. Didn't meet in July. Next meeting: August 6, 2009.

#### **XVII. Liaisons Reports**

- A. **Alcohol and Entertainment Working Group,** Granowitz. Didn't meet in June. Will meet July 22.
- B. **Balboa Park Committee,** Steppke. Didn't meet in July. Will meet in August.
- C. **Project Area Committee,** O'Boyle. Approved uncompleted work in North Park Theatre and passed budget to do so. Approved funding to make theater's sign like original.
- D. **North Park Main Street,** Studebaker. Taste of North Park, Oct. 3. Planting trees at 30<sup>th</sup> and Upas in 3-4 weeks.

#### **XVIII. Next Meeting Date: August 18, 2009.**

#### **IX. MOTION: To adjourn, Elliott/Whitburn. 15-0-0.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Submitted by: Christy Scannell, secretary.

## Land Use and Housing Demolition Policy Concerns and Proposed Solutions

Recently, there has been considerable effort by City Staff and neighborhood groups to support historic review of applicant projects in the older areas of San Diego. The most successful results of the process have been with applicants who are working in good faith. However, lax enforcement and some processes that obscure public involvement have pointed to a variety of systemic issues. The results have been shocking because those who seemingly intend to bypass the system or use political influence to bend the rules in favor of their own interests and are granted demolition permits. Examples of abuses in the system continue and much can be achieved by correcting deficiencies in these systems through often-simple process changes, by adjusting regulations and adjusting policies. When the system supports more transparency it seems that it will be easier to identify those who do not intend to comply to regulations before there is actual demolitions.

Results of the changes to the current codes, regulations and policies would have the overall positives effects:

- Preserving San Diego’s historic architecture and cultural heritage
- Decreasing landfill waste and discarding quality materials such as old growth lumber
- Enable more cost effective reinvestment into the established communities and maintaining the rhythm and scale of the streetscape, which invites aesthetic upgrades and staves off blight.
- **Complying with CEQA and reducing the city’s liability exposure.**

Specific actions that LU & H can take to address the issues concerning demolitions are listed as proposed solutions in the below table.

### Open Issues

Number	Issue	Proposed Solutions
1.	Communication with Stakeholders	
	A. Community Member/Stakeholders are not given timely or accurate notice of pending demolition permits, which inhibits action at the time an actual permit is issued. B. Community Stakeholders have trouble verifying when permitted work or unpermitted work is being done and often only have access to information after the fact. Permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide on-line notices of pending and issued permits in real time, or delay granting the applicants permit until the actual notice is published and available to the public.</li> </ul> <p style="color: red;"><b>An option immediately available for implementation is to process demolitions and upcoming controversial projects or those sites</b></p>

	<p>are not on buildings and building addresses are not required to be visible during construction/demolition</p> <p>C. Permits are issued for properties but <b>notices</b> are delayed and verification is difficult.</p> <p>D. Permit notices are inconsistent and don't provide the planning area or current zoning. Also permits don't list all of the properties involved in the project. <b>Demolition permits don't provide information connecting it to current or future projects.</b><sup>1</sup></p> <p>E. The Code Monitoring Team and the Technical Advisory Team have not undertaken these issues. Yet unpermitted work goes on all of the time and is pervasive in our older communities. The unpermitted work eliminates the ability for the process to work as it was intended and ultimately affects our quality of life.</p> <p><b>Recent examples:</b>          1051 Myrtle Street          4337 Valle Vista</p>	<p><b>with buildings 45 years or older through the community-planning groups since they may be in a better position to understand the cumulative impacts.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require permit notices and addresses to be posted and visible on any construction/demolition site.</li> <li>• Permits provide consistent information regarding all of the addresses/parcels involved in the application, the planning area and zoning information on the permit notice.</li> <li>• Put forward language for these proposals to coincide with the next Land Development <b>Manual "LDM"</b>) or Code or otherwise request staff to make policy and regulation changes effective immediately. Additionally, include community member oversight of the legislative process and changes in the <b>LDM</b> or LDC as they affect demolition policies and historic preservation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b> Opens up the process to the stakeholders in the community and makes the process more transparent. Also makes code enforcement easier.</p>
2.	Legal Issues	
	<p>A. The City's process of taking permit applications out of the Ministerial process to review it for the 45-Year analysis should in and of itself require it to be moved into a Discretionary process. Ministerial projects are for straightforward projects that don't require intervention by staff. Once pulled out of the Ministerial track the project is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise current practices to comply with CEQA and the land development code. When a project is pulled out of the Ministerial process for any reason, it becomes Discretionary.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21083(b); Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 14 [Guidelines], §15130. §15040(c) and 15065(a)(3). *Old City Assn. v City Council*, 229 Ca. App. 3d 111. 1024-25 (1991).

	<p>inherently Discretionary. The city does not abide by this and routinely pulls and reinserts applications returning them back on the Ministerial track. This opens the city to unnecessary liability.</p> <p>B. Buildings may be considered historic under CEQA even if they do not meet the standard for local designation. If there is simply a fair argument that the structure is historic <b>the impacts must be assessed</b> and an environmental document is required.<sup>2</sup> <b>Also the current and foreseeable new project needs analysis because of the cumulative impacts.</b> A larger proportion of demolitions are granted for historic buildings when a fair argument has been made but the CEQA analysis is not provided <b>for both the proposed new project/demolition</b> and therefore demolitions frequently occur without full and complete analysis or mitigation.</p> <p>These practices allow for substantial loss of historic buildings in our established <b>communities and put the City in a position of liability exposure.</b><sup>3</sup></p> <p><b>Recent examples:</b>          4114 Goldfinch          4114 Ibis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrange SOHO co-sponsored training for DSD Staff on interpretation of CEQA law.</li> <li>• <b>Adhere to the environmental review analysis required by CEQA</b> when buildings are over 45 years old and <b>analyze the foreseeable future projects cumulative impacts when stakeholders, consultants and/or City Staff raise concerns about historical resources (CEQA fair argument).</b> Compliance with CEQA is not optional.<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• <b>When a disagreement occurs pertaining to the historic status of a building between staff and community stakeholders this triggers the fair argument standard of CEQA and the application should then follow a Discretionary process.</b></li> <li>• <b>Provide a database system to ensure that cumulative impacts are properly monitored including air quality, water quality and waste.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b> Enforcement of the <b>CEQA, laws and</b> regulations, increased staff and community input. Analysis of potential environmental impacts and alternatives and mitigation to the community through the process or by review of environmental documents (NMD, ND or EIR) when necessary.</p>
3.	Community Plan Historic Surveys and EIR	
	A. It is widely accepted that a	Not all properties can be given

<sup>2</sup> *City of Antioch*, 187 Cal. App. 3d at 1337.

<sup>3</sup> *San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v City and County of San Francisco*, 151 Cal. App. 3d 61 (1984).

<sup>4</sup> *Stanislaus Audubon Society*, 33 Cal.App4th at 159 n.7.

	<p>reconnaissance windshield survey cannot reveal all of the character defining features or historic references related to a given property. The change in the 45-year review process is an example of what can be found while looking at properties more closely. In 2006, the draft Uptown Survey was submitted but not adopted. Concerns were raised at that time because of the potential elimination of further investigation on over half of the properties in Uptown. City Staff now plan to adhere to the State status codes and is working towards adoption of the new Surveys in preparation of Community Plan Updates. Without similar protections invested into the survey process as the current 45-year review, the older communities become vulnerable if a more in-depth analysis for oldest properties in our established San Diego communities are not required before demolition permits are issued.</p> <p>B. An EIR was not conducted before adoption of the General Plan but must be done as part of the Community Plan updates for North Park, Golden Hill and Uptown because these affect some of our oldest communities.</p>	<p>intensive study but further investigation should be warranted when the property is over 45 years old as has been the case citywide with the current 45-year process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City staff should require more intense investigation specifically on properties that are 45 years or older after reconnaissance surveys are adopted as they do now.</li> <li>• EIRs should be conducted during the Community Plan updates.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b> Research of the oldest resources in San Diego’s older communities relate to the historic context of the community and contribute to the story of San Diego’s history. These properties should be given more in-depth analysis before demolition permits are issued.</p> <p>An EIR for each community plan update will include alternatives and mitigation as part of the discussion in the community for the update process and offer opportunities for substantive dialogue and consideration pertaining to the quality of life factors in our communities.</p>
4.	Permit Process Aberrations	
	<p>A. The Preliminary Review process bypasses the 45-year review (a 10 day review by the community) that also results in issuance of demolition permits. It is a loophole that results in land use decisions without adequate analysis or review. This</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of all demolition permits by staff meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards qualifications.</li> <li>• Increase time in the Preliminary Review process to 15 days to secure community input and</li> </ul>



<p>process was used issuing one permit to demolish six houses on Centre Street and the resulting development of the site should not be Ministerial bypassing community input but because its scope should have triggered a <b>CEQA review</b> and Discretionary process.</p> <p>B. When inadequate research is presented by the applicant and there is not enough time for a community response then bad decisions are made simply because the time is up.</p> <p>C. Those who profit from demolishing historic properties pay consultants who leave out facts or misinterpret analysis with apparent intent to bypass CEQA.</p> <p>D. Demolition by neglect is accepted as a persuasive argument to demolish historic buildings instead of promoting adaptive reuse.</p> <p><b>E. Bonuses for DSD staff based on the number of permits processed corrupts the integrity of the review and has been shown to decrease the quality of review all to the detriment of the taxpayers.</b></p> <p><b>Recent Examples:</b> 3761 Centre Street – (Actually 6 houses on Centre Street) 4638 West Tallmadge Drive 801 University Our Lady of Peace 4337 Valle Vista</p> <p><b>Effects:</b> Demolition of historic properties and changes to the historic context of our communities because the Preliminary Review process sidesteps the 45 year review analysis and other community input processes. Often investors neglect or don't maintain the building or property to attempt to make a case that the building is not significant because they have not kept it up. Paid consultants <b>with an agenda to suit their clients submit inadequate, and biased reports pertaining to applicants' projects and cause a loss of confidence and integrity in the process because there is little City supervision or adjustment to mitigate the faulty or inadequate reports. Permits</b></p>	<p>more information <b>or as part of the Community Planning Group meeting process.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Abide by CEQA and</b> provide a mechanism to take projects out of the Ministerial or Preliminary Review process when they require more community input– Such as potentially historic properties, controversial projects or large projects such as the application to demolish six old houses on Centre Street.</li><li>• City staff should provide better oversight of historic reports including reference and data checking with conclusions based on evidence or supportive documentation.</li><li>• Provide <b>community members</b> and City Staff with a <b>feedback mechanism</b> to remove consultants from the city's consultant list when reports repeatedly leave out facts or conclusions are unjustified.</li><li>• <b>When consultant reports leave out facts or conclusions are unjustified consider community input under CEQA fair argument standards and require environmental documents as the next step, well before any demolition permits are issued.</b></li><li>• Promote adaptive reuse and enforce code compliance issues since it encourages improving communities.</li><li>• <b>Discontinue bonuses for DSD staff based on the number of permits processed.</b></li></ul> <p><b>Results:</b> Reduce rushed demolitions of properties that are historic in nature, less vacant lots and reduced losses of the historic integrity of the community.</p>
--	---

	<p>processed for the sake of a bonus instead of quality of the review perpetuates these problems and leads to unjustified demolition of historic properties and violates CEQA and the intent of CEQA.</p>	<p>Beautify and improve the built environment. Improve integrity of the historic review process. Also provide incentives for quality historic research reports by enabling City Staff to raise the standards for submitted reports. Enforces CEQA and codes while protecting historic assets from reckless demolitions.</p>
5.	CEQA and Mitigation for Non-Compliance	
	<p>A. Permits are issued after demolition takes effect.</p> <p>B. Demolition permits are separated from the foreseeable project and there is no analysis of the cumulative impacts.</p> <p>C. Simple permits are issued but are not relevant to the work being completed. (Permit for a water heater does not pertain to siding being removed/installed).</p> <p>D. Penalties are too low to discourage un-permitted demolitions.</p> <p>E. Errors in processing applications by staff or mis-information by applicants resulting in demolition of significant properties.</p> <p><b>Recent Examples:</b>          4337 Valle Vista          3096 Alameda Drive          3809 Seventh Ave. A water heater upgrade permit was issued but work was more extensive.          Kensington Sign</p> <p><b>Effects:</b>          Cumulative impacts are not addressed and are out of CEQA compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects including demolitions on a particular site should not be partitioned. Thus permits for a demolition would not be issued as a bureaucratic process but in context with the proposed new project, zoning, site, planning area and all affected parcels.</li> <li>• Posted addresses and permits during notice and all phases of construction will help inspectors and community members verify the work that is being done matches the issued permit.</li> <li>• DSD should maintain and make a database available to the public that shows the cumulative impacts related to built, planned and future projects (per zoning) for better analysis as projects come forward.</li> <li>• Substantially increasing enforcement and meaningful fines to be determined to exceed recovery fees for the code compliance department. Thus providing revenue from fines towards code compliance (such as the volunteer community code enforcement groups) and preservation efforts as mitigation to the community.</li> </ul>

		<p><b>Results:</b> Projects include the plan for the demolition so that it can be viewed thoughtfully and <b>comprehensively in accordance with CEQA analysis of the whole record. Fines will deter those who wish to circumvent the system</b> and could provide mitigation to the community by funding other preservation projects. <b>Issues with projects</b> would be discovered earlier when enforcement actions are more meaningful</p>
6.	Other Policy Issues and Impacts to Older Undesignated Structures	
	<p>A. Remodels and demolitions differ and need to be permitted differently. Demolitions disguised as remodels cheat the community out of input as well as review of parking requirements. Coastal Commission requirements are clear and could be the model for city codes.</p> <p>B. Zoning creates pressure on commercial historic resources in high-density zones and Conservation Areas need to be implemented. There is currently no mechanism to do so.</p> <p>C. Ministerial projects bypass the goals set out in the community plan and erode the unique character of San Diego communities over time.</p> <p><b>D. Spot planning by frequent community plan amendments undermines the community planning process.</b></p> <p><b>Recent examples:</b>          3475 Tenth (Now 1005 Robinson)          4460 Texas Street and 4374 Cleveland Ave.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise the definition of a remodel so it is limited to 25% or less of the building and include language in requirements effecting remodels mirror the provisions enforced by the Coastal Commission.</li> <li>• <b>Issue fines and</b> provide mitigation measures for projects that exceed permitted actions.</li> <li>• LDC &amp; Procedures for Design Guidelines is missing from General Plan Actions – Implementation of Conservation Areas need to be established for older areas now <b>because they are undergoing plan updates.</b></li> <li>• Ministerial projects need to show conformance and be subject to the Community Plan.</li> <li>• <b>Limit the number of introductions/adoptions of Community Plan updates each year.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b> The public would be clear on the project permitted when remodels</p>

		and demolitions are clearly distinct. Conservation Areas with complementary zoning that recognizes the benefits of historic commercial areas reduces pressure <b>to radically alter</b> the established character of these areas. Ministerial projects that adhere to the community plan will appear complementary to the established streetscape.
--	--	--

Thank you for taking the time to address these topics. In order to make the meeting time actionable we request that a motion is made to support changes to the land development code, regulations and policies and have provided it following this memo.

**Community Planners Advisory Committee on Transportation  
(COMPACT)**

You are invited to an evening to learn about and discuss

**“Transportation in San Diego – *Present and Future.*  
What can we do about it?”**

Wednesday, August 26, 2009 - 6:30PM  
At "Metropolitan Operations Center-II" (MOC-II)  
9192 Topaz Way, in Kearny Mesa

6:30-7:00pm - Hear a presentation by Elyse Lowe, Executive Director of Move San Diego, on their ideas for improving transit effectiveness in the San Diego region.



**Move San Diego** [www.movesandiego.org](http://www.movesandiego.org)

Move San Diego's mission is to organize and serve a broad collaboration of people and organizations to prioritize, fund, and implement sustainable, healthy, convenient transportation and related land use solutions that get people and goods wherever they are going, on time, throughout the San Diego region.

7:00- 8:00pm - Join us for an Open Forum on Transportation and let us know how you feel about our local and regional transportation.

What are your major concerns? How can we make our voices heard and influence the transportation planning decisions being made for us?

(COMPACT is made up of both representatives from the various Planning groups in the City of San Diego as well as interested residents. We meet to discuss transportation issues and provide input to City Staff and Community Planning Groups.)