



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE
AGENDA: September 15, 2009 – 6:30 PM
<http://www.northparkplanning.org>
2901 NORTH PARK WAY, 2ND 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 September 15, 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. History Day – LU&H
 - 2. SANDAG Mid-City Rapid Bus Update
 - 3. Lynn Mulholland – Mission Valley Community Council
 - E. Approval of Previous Minutes: August 18, 2009.
 - F. Treasurer's Report – Steve Chipp
 - G. Announcements –
 - 1. Dedication ceremony for NPMS tree planting, Sea Rocket Bistro, 5 pm 9/16
 - 2. Fresh-n-Easy “groundbreaking”, 3 pm September 17, 2009
 - 3. Taste of University Heights – September 20, 2009
 - 4. Italian Film Festival
 - 5. NPCA Community Clean-up – Sat. September 19,2009
 - H. Planner's Report - Marlon Pangilinan, 619.235.5293; 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 31, 2009 CANCELLED. PF/PA September 3, 2009
Members Present: Rene Vidales, Sal Arechiga, Lynn Elliott, Rob Steppke, Ernie Bonn. Non-voting: Dionne Carlson.
- A. **Request for Head-In Parking on Kansas Street between Adams and Monroe Avenues.** – This pilot project will convert the west side of Kansas Street from parallel to head-in parking, and will increase the number of available on-street parking spaces from 30 spaces to 58 spaces. **Motion: To approve the parking project in concept with the condition that the street is mitigated for flooding with adequate curb prior to implementation of the parking pilot program.**
Elliott/Steppke 5-0-0

B. Installation of North Park Community Identification Signs – Proposal to install community signage at the entrances to North Park in order to differentiate and define North Park, and to inform residents of the community in which they reside. **Motion: To support the project of the installation of North Park community identification signs in concept. Steppke/Elliott 4-0-1 (Bonn abstained)**

C. Letter to Redevelopment Agency regarding the status of the Parking Garage Public Art Project. Priority for this project has recently been reduced by the Redevelopment Agency. **Motion: To support in concept a clarification of the timeline for the North Park Parking Garage Public Art Project. Elliott/Bonn 5-0-0.**

D. Letter to MTS regarding the delay of rolling out the Compass Card Program to all public transit. Lack of proper function of existing re-loaded passes has prompted numerous complaints. **Motion: To support a concept letter regarding the challenges of the Compass Card implementation. Steppke/Elliott 5-0-0.**

V. Action Items:

A. Demolition Letter for LU&H "History Day" – Janet O’Dea/Leo Wilson. (7:30 p.m.)

VI. Information Items:

A. Community Gardens Proposal – Annie Lorrie Anderson, Kathleen Ferrier (7:40 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. (7:50 p.m.)

VIII. Subcommittee Reports (5 Minutes Maximum per Report) (8:00 p.m.)

A. Urban Design/Project Review, Keoni Rosa, Robert Barry – NP Adult Community Center, 6:00pm 1st Monday. Next meeting October 1, 2009

B. Public Facilities/Public Art, Rene Vidales, Sal Arechiga -NPMS, 3076 University Ave, 6:30 pm, 1st Thursday. Next meeting October 5, 2009.

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

A. Alcohol and Entertainment Working Group – Vicki Granowitz

B. Balboa Park Committee – Vicki Granowitz

C. Project Area Committee - Judi O’Boyle

D. Maintenance Assessment District – Ryan Silva/Rob Steppke

E. North Park Parking Management Working Group - Rene Vidales

F. North Park Main Street - Liz Studebaker

X. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items

XI. Next Meeting Date: October 20, 2009

XII. Adjournment (8:20 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
 - To Contact Urban Design/ Project Review, call Keoni Rosa at (619) 294-9018 or kr@keonirosa.com
- BYLAWS REQUIRE THAT YOU CONTACT THE CHAIR IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND THE MEETING:**

Land Use and Housing Demolition Policy Concerns & 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 process 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 demolition.

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
- Providing applicants a clear path to navigate the process
- 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 Land Use & Housing can take to address the issues concerning demolitions are listed as proposed solutions in the below table.

Open Issues

	Issue	Proposed Solutions
1.	Communication with Stakeholders	Proposals
	<p>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.</p> <p>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 are not on buildings and building addresses are not required to be visible during construction/demolition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • An option immediately available for implementation is to process demolitions and upcoming controversial projects or those sites with buildings 45 years or older through the community-planning groups since they may be in a better position to understand the cumulative impacts. • Require permit notices and addresses to be posted and visible on any construction/demolition site.

	<p>C. Permits are issued for properties but notices 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. Demolition permits don't provide information connecting it to current or future projects.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permits provide consistent information regarding all of the addresses/parcels involved in the application, the planning area and zoning information on the permit notice. • Put forward language for these proposals to coincide with the next Land Development Manual "LDM") 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 LDM or LDC as they affect demolition policies and historic preservation. <p>Results: 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	Proposals
	<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/evaluation by staff. Once pulled out of the Ministerial track the project is 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 must be considered historic under CEQA if there is a fair argument that they are eligible for the California register even if they are not already designated. If there is simply a fair argument that the structure is eligible the impacts must be assessed and an environmental document is required. Also the current and foreseeable new project needs analysis because of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request an evaluation and opinion from the City Attorney on current practices for project applications that are presented as Ministerial but require extra handling during processing. Including how the current handling of applications conforms/does not conform with CEQA and the LDC, and practical recommendations in processing applications to reduce liability. • Arrange SOHO and City Attorney co-sponsored training for DSD Staff on interpretation of CEQA law. • Adhere to the environmental review and analysis required by CEQA when buildings are over 45 years old and analyze the foreseeable future projects cumulative impacts when stakeholders, consultants and/or City Staff raise concerns about historical resources (CEQA fair argument). Compliance with CEQA is not optional.

	<p>cumulative impacts. Demolitions are granted for historic buildings when a fair argument has been made but the CEQA analysis is not provided for both the proposed new project/demolition. Therefore demolitions occur without full and complete analysis or mitigation.</p> <p>Effects: These practices allow for substantial loss of historic buildings in our established communities and may put the City in a position of liability exposure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When a disagreement occurs pertaining to the historic status of a building between staff and/or community stakeholders this triggers the fair argument standard of CEQA and the application should then follow a Discretionary process. • Provide a database system to ensure that cumulative impacts are properly monitored including air quality, water quality and waste. <p>Results: Enforcement of the CEQA, laws and 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	
	<p>A. It is widely accepted that a 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 plans to adhere to the State status codes and is working towards adoption of new Surveys in preparation of Community Plan Updates.</p> <p>The older communities become vulnerable if a more in-depth analysis for the oldest properties in our established San Diego communities is 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>Not all properties can be given intensive study but further investigation should be warranted for the oldest properties, as has been the case citywide with the current 45-year process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff should require more intense investigation such as when properties are 65 years or older after reconnaissance surveys are adopted. • Make survey data available on-line within City departments and to the public. • EIRs should be conducted during the Community Plan updates. <p>Results: 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 older 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 and offer opportunities for</p>

		substantive dialogue and consideration pertaining to the quality of life factors in our communities.
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 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 CEQA review 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. Once the resource is demolished, the report, if inaccurate, is the only documentation left behind and it does not adequately represent the history or legacy.</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>Effects: Demolition of historic properties and changes to the historic context of our communities and the Preliminary Review process sidesteps the 45 year review 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 with an agenda to suit their clients submit inadequate, and biased reports pertaining to applicants' projects and cause a loss of confidence and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of all demolition permits by staff meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards qualifications. • Preliminary Review should not bypass securing community input so instead it should be part of the Community Planning Group meeting process. • Abide by CEQA and 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. • City staff should provide better oversight of historic reports including reference and data checking with conclusions based on evidence or supportive documentation. • Provide community members and City Staff with a feedback mechanism to remove consultants from the city's consultant list when reports repeatedly leave out facts or conclusions are unjustified. • 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, before any demolition permits are issued. • Promote adaptive reuse and enforce code compliance issues since it encourages improving communities. <p>Results: Reduce rushed demolitions of properties that are historic in nature, less vacant lots and reduced losses of the historic integrity of the</p>

	<p>integrity in the process because there is little City supervision or adjustment to mitigate the faulty or inadequate reports. Permits processed for the sake of a bonus instead of quality of the review perpetuates these problems and leads to unjustified demolition of historic properties.</p>	<p>community. 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 which may be the only documentation pertaining to the resource. Enforces CEQA and codes while protecting historic assets from reckless demolitions .</p>
<p>5. CEQA and Mitigation for Non-Compliance</p>		
	<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>Effects: Cumulative impacts are not addressed and are out of CEQA compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • Substantially increasing enforcement and meaningful fines are in the work plan and need to be completed. A substantial and punitive interim penalty should be established until all the details of the fine in the work plan are fully approved. <p>Results: Projects include the plan for the demolition so that it can be viewed thoughtfully and comprehensively in accordance with CEQA analysis of the whole record. Fines will deter those who wish to circumvent the system and could provide mitigation to the community by funding other preservation projects. Issues with projects 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. Applicants obtain legitimate permits for a minor item or partial permit but exceed and cheat the permit resulting in major demolition/losses. (i.e. kitchen remodel permit results in tear down)</p> <p>C. 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>D. Ministerial projects bypass the goals set out in the community plan and erode the unique character of San Diego communities over time.</p> <p>E. Spot planning by frequent community plan amendments undermines the community planning process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • An ongoing inspection at various thresholds to ensure that demolition of existing resources is not excessive. • Issue fines and provide mitigation measures for projects that exceed permitted actions. • LDC & Procedures for Design Guidelines is missing from General Plan Actions – Implementation of Conservation Areas need to be established for older areas now because they are undergoing plan updates. • Ministerial projects need to show conformance and be subject to the Community Plan. • Limit the number of introductions/adoptions of Community Plan updates each year. <p>Results: The public would be clear on the project permitted when remodels and demolitions are clearly distinct. Conservation Areas with complementary zoning that recognizes the benefits of historic commercial areas reduces pressure to radically alter the established character of these areas.</p> <p>Ministerial projects that adhere to the community plan will appear complementary to the established streetscape.</p>

Thank you for taking the time to address these topics. In order to make these proposals actionable we request that a motion is made to support proposals as presented including changes to the land development code, regulations and policies.

Uptown Planners
September 1, 2009

SAN DIEGO ITALIAN FILM FESTIVAL

the art of italian cinema



The festival this year kicks off with a major 4 film retrospective of the Tuscan director, heir of the *commedia all'italiana*, Paolo Virzi'. All screenings, except for Nov. 6, will be at the Museum of Photographic Arts, beginning at 7 P.M.

- Fri. 16 Oct. **La bella vita** (Living It Up) Paolo Virzi'
The story of a working class family, in Piombino, Tuscany, dealing with a depressed economy and their own anxieties.
- Sat. 17 Oct. **Ferie d'agosto** (August Vacation) Paolo Virzi'
Political and cultural differences divide two families during their summer holiday on the island of Ventotene, off the Naples coast.
- Thurs. 22 Oct. **Ovosodo** (Hardboiled Egg) Paolo Virzi'
A young, shy man deals with disillusion and compromises while finding his place in life.
- Fri. 23 Oct. **My name is Tanino** Paolo Virzi'
A young Sicilian goes to America to return a camera left behind by a tourist friend and finds that dreams don't always match reality.
- Sat. 31 Oct. **Notte blu cobalto** (Cobalt Blue Night) Daniele Gangemi
A whimsical tale that follows a first time pizza deliverer as he realizes that his deliveries involve more than just pizza.
- Sun. 1 Nov. **Uno su due** (One Out of Two) Eugenio Cappuccio



7600 Fay Ave #390, La Jolla, 92037

619.459.1638 contact@sandiegoitalianfilmfestival.com

sandiegoitalianfilmfestival.com

SAN DIEGO ITALIAN FILM FESTIVAL

the art of italian cinema

- A 33 year old attorney, following a devastating medical diagnosis, experiences a rebirth.
- Mon. 2 Nov. **Basta un niente** (Before You Know It) Ivan Polidoro
Three neopolitan friends, determined to make a living, improvise as thieves with the help of one of their grandfathers.
- Tues. 3 Nov. **Se fossi in te** (If I Were You) Giulio Manfredonia
Three discontent men magically switch identities, each with the person most envied, but things do not turn out as expected.
- Wed. 4 Nov. **Apnea** Roberto Dordit
When a former fellow fencing champion dies mysteriously of a heart attack, Paolo decides to investigate—and discovers that his friend was not the person he thought he was.
- Thur. 5 Nov. **L'estate di mio fratello** (My Brother's Summer) Pietro Reggiani
When Sergio learns that he will soon have a baby brother, his imagination kicks into gear in devious and alarming ways—and then life takes a devastating turn.
- Fri. 6 Nov. **La vera leggenda di Tony Vilar** (The True Legend of Tony Vilar)
Giuseppe Gagliardi
7:00 p.m. at Birch North Park Theatre, open at 6:15
Tony Vilar, an Italian in Argentina, was a singing superstar in the 1960's, but suddenly disappeared. Peppe's quest, to find Tony, needs help from some unforgettable characters.

Festival Gala Night

Beginning at 5 pm at the Museum of Photographic Arts in Balboa Park
Order tickets at the Gala page

- Sat. 7 Nov. Gala Italian dinner and music followed by the film:
La seconda notte di nozze (The Second Wedding Night) Pupi Avati
Kind hearted Giordano was left with half a deck as the result of electric shock treatments. A letter from his sister-in-law changes his outlook.
- Wed 14 Nov. **Mater Natura** (Mother Nature) Massimo Andrei
Opens with an adrenalin-filled mayhem of cross-dressers and transsexuals rehearsing for a play. Desiderio, unhappy in love, and a group of her friends, set-up an organic farm.
7:00 p.m. At Birch North Park Theatre, open at 6:15



7600 Fay Ave #390, La Jolla, 92037

619.459.1638 contact@sandiegoitalianfilmfestival.com

sandiegoitalianfilmfestival.com