



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: Monday, April 7, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.

North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue

I. Parliamentary Items

- A. Call to Order: 6:04 PM
NPPC Board Members seated: Hill, Carlson, Gebreselassie, Levin, Codraro, Morrison (Lucky), Morrison (Roger)
Community Members seated: Bonn, Callen (6:10)
Board Members present but not seated: Granowitz
Community Members & others Present: Brian Asaro, Ryan McCrary, Kerrigan Diehl
- B. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda
No modifications. Motion to adopt: Granowitz/Morrison L, 8-0-0
- C. Approval of Previous Minutes: March 3, 2014
Motion to approve: Bonn/Carlson, 4-0-4 (Codraro, Levin, Morrison L, Morrison R abstained - absent) Correction: none
- D. Announcements
Bonn: 100 year celebration of the University Heights Branch Library will be held Saturday, April 12 from noon to 3PM, at the library.
Granowitz: Meet the Chief of Police, April 28th 6pm to 7:30 pm at the Centre.

II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each).

None.

III. Action

- **Verizon – Covenant SDP – 2930 Howard Avenue (Project No. 340954):** Proposed Site Development Permit (SDP) for the installation of sixteen antennas, sixteen RRU units, three GPS antennas, and one surge protector behind a new radio frequency transparent screen on the roof of an existing building. The project also includes installation of equipment cabinets and an emergency generator on a new metal grate platform behind a corrugated metal screen on the roof of an existing building. The project is located at 2930 Howard Avenue within the MCCPD-CN-1 zone of the Greater North Park Community Plan Area. The project is a Process 3 decision that is made by the Hearing Officer and can be appealed to the Planning Commission. Project Manager: Alex Hempton, (619) 446-5349, ahempton@sandiego.gov

Discussion: Kerrigan Diehl project rep, presented final simulation (2 views) of cosmetic treatments requested by UD/PR subcommittee on March 3.

Public Comments: none

Board Comments:

Ernie: Did church approve the boards recommended changes? Ans. Yes

Rachel: Does any equipment project past the screening shown? Ans: No

Steve: Q: Screen Height? A: 7ft Q: Could the screening be placed closer to center of bldg? Ans: Yes, however, current placement provides better architectural design integrity and aesthetics as requested by the board. Q: How small could the screening footprint be? Ans: approx.. 15 x 15 ft. Steve comment: The smaller the footprint the less visible from a distance.

Motion: To approve the design as presented. (Description: Hexagonal screening wall placement on top of existing hexagonal building to fully conceal equipment. Each screening wall segment is framed in Brick texture and color to match the texture and color of the existing brick on the existing building). *Bonn/Carlson 8-0-0* (Modified “Alternative B” as described in 3/3/2014 minutes) .

B. North Park Community Plan Update – Draft Urban Design Element: Continuing discussion of the North Park Community Plan Update. The Draft Urban Design Element will be reviewed and discussed.

City of San Diego Project Mgr: Marlon Pangilinan, (619) 235-5293, mpangilinan@sanidiego.gov

Discussion:

Update from Vicki G.: Howard Blackson has passed our input combined with his work on the element to Mike Singleton (KTU&A), who will be finishing up the work on this element. Howard wrote the element from our input - has to edit down for the City – As requested by the board, he is pushing for Placemaking language rather than “Transit Oriented Development” language

VG discussed progress on Mobility, Hist. Preservation, Rec elements. Hold up on rec. element is equivalencies. NP is approx. 100 acres short of needed park space. - few opportunities to buy land for park space because of high cost. Still in negotiation with City on: How will our DIF fees be used in regional parks? Issues with joint use park equivalencies- City used 24 hrs park equivalency, even though joint use parks are only available for a much small amount of time to the public (not available during school hours) . There will be a joint meeting of the Planning Commission & the Park and Rec board - 3rd Thursday in May(May 15 1:30 pm) at Planning Commission – Board members are requested to attend and speak out. The decision on acceptable equivalencies will be decided at this meeting. Once the equivalency issue is settles, NPPC needs to vote on hierarchy of Park choices/opportunities – this will likely happen at June PF subcommittee.

Economic Development element - Boundary issues have severely impacted progress on this element and its timeline. Staff will present latest to full board.

Public Facilities: Libraries/schools etc. This element is mostly pro forma, however Rene Vidales is working on some additional considerations

Boundary Issue: NP has consistently asked for appropriate process. Staff is currently preparing plan update docs back to current boundary since Filner’s departure.

Note: Neighborhood boundaries are different from Planning Group boundaries. NPPC supported UHCDC motion to use assessors map boundaries for the Neighborhood of University Heights. NPPC needs to formulate some language for inclusion in the community plan update that allows businesses and residents of a neighborhood to describe where they live and which does not preclude residents from saying they live in University Heights when the assessors map shows they do. Dionne & Vicki G. to propose some language for discussion by board at next meeting.

Lucky: Re MiniPark. Will the City assume maintenance? VG - not likely. P-BID will help with that.
Lucky: Can we figure out a public private project partnership to pay for maintenance? Can we ask for revenues from cell tower installations to pay for maintenance? VG - We can but City won't support.

Daniel: If the site is used for Paid parking temporarily until park is built, could we use revenue from parking for a maintenance endowment fund for the mini-park?. Vicki G: Possibly, Main Street is exploring that option.

Peter: Similar to NPPC's goals with a CPOZ. With revenues from Cell installations, could there be a trade-off of benefits conveyed for benefits to the community received, e.g. park maintenance funding for the privilege of installing cell facilities on public or private bldg. in North Park? VG: not likely DC: Was told that the General Fund receives revenues from public land installations and they are highly unlikely to release those for neighborhood use.

Ernie: at Uptown Planners there was a discussion of hillcrest "Super area" like CPOZ. University Heights density and height to be discussed at Uptown in June.

Vicki: Should we place some language about "Neighborhood" boundaries & naming being up to the choice of the residents of that neighborhood in the community plan. Consensus was Yes, put on April agenda. VG & DC to draft something for discussion.

Dionne: Prepared 3 items for discussion under Urban Design.

- 1) **Integrate historic preservation protections & incentives into all our CPOZ zones :** E.g. Preserving a non-designated (because if the resource is designated they have to preserve it anyway) community-identified historic building on site in accordance with Secretary of Interior standards within the CPOZ could net the developer some lovely and desirable and profitable benefit(s) from the toolbox... like requiring less parking and/or easier FAR standard, and/or an extra floor, etc. Goal being to preserve the historic resource on site, and to make it profitable to do so.
- 2) **Cell tower installations:** Address in design guidelines in community plan. Is there is a precedent in some other city for requiring more aesthetically delightful installations than those we've been seeing (including possibly some public art) , and how we could incorporate language into our Urban Design element that might usefully encourage more appropriate, creative, less bland designs? It might be helpful for the utilities to have some guidance.
- 3) **Encouraging Redevelopment of Substandard housing via Minimum Lot Consolidation requirement to receive bonuses in a CPOZ:** Discussed with Marlon and Bernie at EIR scoping meeting the idea of not automatically giving any bonus at all for lot-consolidation, but only for consolidating *enough* square footage (within a CPOZ) to make it financially viable to do a really good project (underground parking, lose the curbcuts, properly articulated height, roof gardens/decks, etc) . The object being to encourage redevelopment via lot-consolidation among the "Huffmans" /substandard housing in areas like Florida street, (and to discourage the demolition of our stock of craftsman/Spanish revival cottages and replacement with more substandard housing). Marlon and Bernie have asked the City's Economic Development analyst to see what the threshold might be to make redeveloping some of

the “Huffmans“ into better projects economically viable. Set a minimum square footage for lot consolidation and a minimum requirement for provision of community benefit before any bonuses could kick in.

Ernie - Perhaps getting a credit to use elsewhere if save historic structure on site? (like carbon tx credits)
Discussion on secretary of interior stds., and of problem of who would determine if the structure was historic if it is not designated.

Ernie raised the communities support for conservation districts, and general disappointment was expressed at the City’s unwillingness to pursue this idea.

Peter: Re Language in urban design element on cell towers – not sure we can “incentivize” better design, but perhaps include language that “encourages” it.

Discussion of the City’s recent changes permitting Tandem parking. The NorthParker incorporated tandem parking, despite the fact that current community plan prohibits it. How did that happen?
Consensus – Place stronger language in Plan update that prohibits the use of tandem parking in Greater North park – strong enough to override the city’s muni-code changes.

IV. Information

Peter: Crosswalk at Cypress that was prioritized on our CIP list is underway – Crosswalk will have pedestrian activated flashing lights.

Ernie: There was a pedestrian injury at Howard and Park recently. Inquire whether due to Rapid Bus construction confusion?

V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items

None

VI. Adjournment (7:10 pm) Adjourned *Daniel G/Roger M; 9-0-0*

Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Monday, May 5, 2014

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit northparkplanning.org or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at hillpeter@hotmail.com or (619) 846-2689.

** **Subcommittee Membership & Quorum:** When all 15 elected NPPC Board Member seats are filled, the maximum total of seated (voting) UD-PR Subcommittee members is 13 (up to 7 elected NPPC Board Members and up to 6 seated North Park community members). To constitute a quorum, a majority of the seated UD-PR Subcommittee members must be elected NPPC Board Members.*

*** **Community Voting Members:** North Park residents and business owners may gain UD-PR Subcommittee voting rights by becoming a General Member of the NPPC and by attending three UD-PR Subcommittee meetings. Please sign-in on the meeting attendance list and notify the Chair or Vice-Chair if you are attending to gain Subcommittee voting rights.*

***North Park Planning Committee** meetings are held on the second floor of the North Park Christian Fellowship (2901 North Park Way, 2nd Floor), on the third Tuesday of each month, at 6:30 pm. The next scheduled NPPC meeting is on April 15, 2014.*

For additional information about the North Park Planning Committee, please like our Facebook page and follow our Twitter feed:

 [NorthParkPlanning](https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning)

 [@NPPlanning](https://twitter.com/NPPlanning)