



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

PUBLIC FACILITIES & TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES: Wednesday, July 8, 2015

I. Parliamentary Items

II. Call to Order at 6:05 pm

III. Attendance:

Board Members: Daniel Gebreselassie Chair Lucky Morrison, Peter Hill, Dionne Carlson (arrives at 6:20 pm) Vicki Granowitz, Rene Vidales (leaves 6:50 pm)

Community Members: Kitty Callen (arrives at 6:15 pm)

IV. Chair's Comments: None

V. Approval of Previous Minutes:

- a. Motion to Approve May 13, 2015 Minutes. Hill/ Gebreselassie 3-0-2 (L. Morrison & Vidales absent in May)
- b. Motion to Approve June 10, 2015 Minutes. L. Morrison/ Gebreselassie 5-0-0

VI. Announcements:

- a. **UAMP EIR Appeal at City Council 7/27/15 2**
- b. Bonn reports via email that Chaffey will pay for the improvement **requested last month.** Also via email Adrian Granda confirms Councilmember Gloria asked that the \$6,500 allocation be included in the FY 16 University Heights CDC parking budget to apply to construction of a pop-out at the southwest corner of Adams and Florida. Mr. Chaffee confirmed with me he would be willing to finance the rest of the design and construction costs as part of his development.

VII. Non Agenda Public Comment - none

VIII. Action Items:

- a. **All-way stop for 29th St & North Park Way**, through the alternative process identified in CP 200-08. Vote was deferred from last month due to a noticing problem, see June PF&T Minutes for background and justification. **MOTION To Approve an all-way stop at the intersection of 29th Street and North Park Way. Granowitz/Hill 5-0-0**
- b. **North Park Community Plan Update Draft Recreation Element & Motion to accept in concept with the identified changes the edited Rec Element & Draft Governance Process on Equivalencies. Including listed question to be answered and resolved by the City and the NPPC. Granowitz/Carlson 6-0-0 Edited Documents below & attached.**

IX. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items.

- a. Recreation Element
 - i. Prioritization of Park Projects
- b. Indiana between Robinson & Cyprus parking conversion to head in

X. Next Meeting date: PF&T Subcommittee: Wednesday, August 2015, 6 p.m.

XI. Adjournment 8 pm

**A DRAFT GOVERNANCE PROCESS for
Developer Impact Fees-Based
NORTH PARK EQUIVALENCIES
July 21, 2015**

I. The North Park Planning Committee (NPPC) believes that a “Governance Process for Equivalencies” should be added to the review process for park projects that utilize North Park Developer Impact Fees (DIF).

a. As such, NPPC requests that the following Governance Process for DIF-based North Park Equivalencies be incorporated into the North Park Community Plan update.

i. To the extent possible Balboa Park equivalency projects will be identified and prioritized in the NPPC Financing Plan.

ii. If North Park generated DIFs are used for a project in the East Mesa area of Balboa Park (a Regional Park) the NPPC shall be included in the review process in the following ways:

- 1. The NPPC has identify Balboa Park equivalencies that we deem acceptable for the use of DIF within the Recreation Element.**
 - NP DIF cannot be used for facilities that are predominantly used for organized sports, including but not limited to ballfields, concession facilities, and tennis stadiums.
 - NP DIF is precluded from being used for projects such as parking lots and security lights,
 - NP DIF is to be limited to recreational activities, whether passive or active that while potentially drawing people from outside Greater North Park &/or Greater Golden Hill would also be used by significant numbers of local residents, ie Bird Park Projects, skateboard, & BMX facilities.
- 2. Equivalency projects and/or improvements that do not require a GDP shall be noticed to the NPPC with documentation (but without staff presentations) for advisory input and recommendations. These projects may be bundled and made available for NPPC recommendations quarterly or as needed.**
- 3. If a General Development Plan (GDP) is required, the NPPC shall be included as an addition to the standard Park and Recreation (CP 600-33) project review and input process, as well as have the ability to make official advisory recommendations to the Balboa Park Committee, Morley Field Recreation Council, Park & Recreation Board Park, & appropriate City Departments. Following the typical public workshop sponsored by City staff (and usually through the Balboa Park Committee):**
 - a. If requested there would be a joint meeting of the NPPC and NPPC for a staff presentation of the GDP.**

- b. NPPC would take the lead as the more experienced body with major land use decisions and the greater capacity for public outreach.
- c. Advisory comments would be submitted to the appropriate bodies for consideration in editing & updating a GDP.
- d. Number of staff presentations would be limited to an initial presentation, with written updates reported at significant milestones.
- e. The Final GDP will be delivered to the chair of the NPPC & the NPRC, these groups can make a formal advisory recommendations to the appropriate bodies.
- f. Annual reporting of DIF expenditures would be provided to the NPPC.
- g. Updates on construction expenditures and project progress will be provided to the NPPC at regular interval &/or key milestones.

II. The NPPC, required that transparency & open communication be maintained by City staff and all committees within Balboa Park that have oversight of any North Park equivalency projects under considered, whether or not the utilization of DIF funds is being contemplated.

III. The process described above is to be placed in Chapter 12 Implementation under 12.5 Priority Public Improvements and Funding, or other appropriate location within the North Park Community Plan.

IV. OTHER ISSUES

I. Questions for the City

- a. The NPPC is concerned limited DIF could be eaten up by Balboa Park projects.
- b. What safeguards are in place to mitigate this potential?
- c. What percentage of an Equivalency can be used to meet park standards?
- d. What percentage of DIF can be used for equivalencies?

II. Question for the NPPC/City

- a. The NPPC has prioritized all North Park projects ahead of Balboa Park projects.
- b. However, the NPPC also finds there might be a particular equivalency project(s) located in Balboa Park that could become a priority over a North Park based projects.**
 - i. NPPC acknowledges this could be a slipper slop but finds with appropriate safeguards there could be a positive result for North Park residents and Balboa Park
 - 1. We therefore suggest the creation of criteria & a process for such an eventuality, (ie when an equivalency could become a priority over a North Park based project)
 - a. Consideration could be given to factors such as health & safety for tot lots, playgrounds or skate parks for example
 - b. Grants that become available
 - c. Project readiness
 - d. North Park community request