



# **NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE**

[northparkplanning.org](http://northparkplanning.org)

## **URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

**DRAFT MINUTES: Monday, November 3, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.**

**North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue**

### **I. Parliamentary Items**

#### **A. Called to Order 6:05 PM**

Seated NPPC Board Members: Peter Hill, Daniel Gebreselassie, Rachel Levin (left approx. 7 pm), Steve Codraro, Vicki Granowitz, Howard Blackson, Sarah McAlear  
Seated General Members: Ernie Bonn, Rob Steppke, Kitty Callen (arrived 6:10)

#### **B. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda**

No modifications. Motion to adopt. Granowitz/Blackson, 9-0-0

#### **C. Approval of Previous Minutes: October 6, 2014**

Corrections: minor typos and corrections brought forward by Bonn via email. Motion to approve as amended. Bonn/Steppe, 7-0-2 (Blackson/Granowitz abstain).

#### **D. Announcements**

Ernie Bonn:

- Taste of University Heights on Nov 9, 12-3pm.
- Cyclosdias in Hillcrest/Bankers Hill area on the Nov 9<sup>th</sup> (6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel streets will be closed).
- 2014 Green Homes Tour (sponsored by SD Green Building Council) on Nov 9, 11am-4pm.
- Adams Avenue's 'Bikes, Brews & Brats' event on Nov 8, 10am-2pm.

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

Vicki: There appears to be agreement with City and Utilities on a new process for utility undergrounding; trying to get meeting with DSD to address the utility boxes that appear to pop up with no notice.

Peter: went to City-sponsored Code Enforcement workshop. Learned that the Code Enforcement Department is adding inspectors.

### **III. Action**

#### **A. 4162, 4164, 4166 Mississippi St. – Vesting Tentative Map (Project No. 366687):**

Beth Reiter presenting. Process 3 project. Map Waiver to convert 3 existing residential dwelling

units into condominiums on a 0.121-acre site. The site is located at 4162 Mississippi St. in the MCCPD-MR-1250B zone of the Greater North Park Community Plan area. *Tabled from Oct. 6 meeting.*

No Audience questions.

Board Q&A summary: There are current tenants, and they will have first right of refusal if/when the buildings are listed for sale. The buildings were built around 1920. The 3 existing units are detached (do not share walls). No additional units are being built. There is more parking provided than is required (there are 3 full spaces, and a 4<sup>th</sup> space that has a strange curb but is useable—note this is two sets of two tandem spaces; only 2 parking spaces are technically required). The properties are not historically relevant. Plans for tenant improvements include those required by architect deficiencies report, including paint, driveway repair, replacing electrical, roofing, decking, add fire alarms and landscaping. There is concern that the condos will not have “current” amenities. Questions involving the possible sale of the buildings, the updating of kitchens, etc. couldn’t be sufficiently answered, as the owner of the property was not present.

**Motion:** Move to deny, due to lack of pertinent information and desire to maintain apartment stock. Steppke/ Gebreselassie 7-2-1 (Blackson/McAlear oppose, Levin abstain)

- B. North Park Community Plan Update – Draft Urban Design Element:** *Continued from Oct. 6 meeting.* Not many people had full copies of the Design Element, so much of the conversation was reviewing discussion and points from prior minutes. Marlon provided a Table of Contents. Roundtable discussion summary: We’re aware that the consultants hired to finish this project have finished their contract, despite not having a finished copy, and that the City is left performing much of the remaining work. Howard asked for the City to provide a modifiable copy of the document, to allow for NPPC to edit, stating much of the work we’ve done has been placed, but it’s clunky and doesn’t “sing.”

Board comments—beginning with Howard (allotted additional time from other members)

Major concerns mentioned include:

- Implementation process confusion (document appears to use “guidelines” and “policies” interchangeably)
- CPIOZs are community-wide, instead of place-specific; there are many unique neighborhoods and the original intent was to use this tool for smaller areas (this relates to a repeated concern of the element being vague and lacking a “feel” of our community). The idea of CPIOZ A (ministerial) and CPIOZ B (discretionary) seems to have completely disappeared.
- There is nothing transit-oriented, no mention of El Cajon Blvd.
- A developer would have to read the entire document to determine what is relevant to their site

Examples of the document lacking cohesion include:

- on p3 there are icons that don’t link to anything in the rest of the document (just “stuff”)
- the general objectives and policies are there, but there is no indication of cohesion with other elements
- figure 4.1 on p9 is out of place and hits on topics that haven’t been set up in the document

- figure 4.8 is bizarre—the design focus seems to have no relation to anything else in the document

Daniel points out the use of subjective words in terms of sustainability. “Smart Growth” is put out there but has no components that are future-looking (i.e., electric car parking, community wifi, conservation, trash). The recommended trees are aesthetically pleasing, but have no positive environmental impact. Ernie and Kitty repeated concerns of sustainability—acknowledging that it is a different element, but since we don’t have access to it there is no understanding of how well the elements will link up. Peter reiterates request to avoid subjective terms (i.e., growth infill, high level of quality).

Peter indicates the need to reformat for clarity—he likes Uptown’s element and thought it was well-organized. Howard agreed that it did well at taking on the issue of building height, and he doesn’t see that in our Plan.

Vicki suggests one of the problems with the Code is that it will allow someone to tear down and rebuild, which will perpetuate poor design (Huffmans), because builders will still get access to pre-conforming setbacks to put parking in front. We have a similar problem in commercial areas. Vicki talked to Amanda Lee and she understands the issue, but says you can’t have Code for one type of building. Howard asserts that we can request what we want in the policy, but that the City is putting the regulations before the policy. The LDC relates to the entire City, and PDOs are being absorbed into the LDC. This is causing Howard to worry because the LCD covers the City, which includes suburban lots, etc.

Steve suggests we use real-world photos. Provided a full page of comments to Vicki and board for discussion.

Public Comment: George Franck: The first section (4 pages) there are so many different policy ideas, but all numbers with lots of overlap. It’s very busy, very redundant. Try to consolidate all those ideas. Don’t understand the difference between policy, action, and objective. Also concerned that almost half of the document pertains to CPIOZ.

Summary: The group desires to take the document and rework it ourselves since KTU&A’s contract is over. An ad-hoc committee was previously convened and is now being re-established with Steve, Howard, Peter and Robert (up to 7 people, more may be added). No new topics will be produced while cleaning up the copy, just administratively reformatting what we were provided and perhaps including items that have been historically well-covered in meetings and charrettes that did not appear in this draft.

**City of San Diego Project Mgr:** Marlon Pangilinan, (619) 235-5293, [mpangilinan@saniego.gov](mailto:mpangilinan@saniego.gov)

**C. Proposed NPPC letter to Planning Department – Action**

**Motion:** To write a letter to the Planning Department regarding issues and concerns related to the Urban Design Element of the Community Plan Update (draft of document from City appears undated; will refer to as the Oct 2014 draft). Gebreselassie/Howard 9-0-0

**IV. Information: None**

**V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items: None**

**VI. Adjournment** 8:00pm Adjourned *Blackson/Callen; 9-0-0*

**Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Monday, January 5, 2015**

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit [northparkplanning.org](http://northparkplanning.org) or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at [hillpeter@hotmail.com](mailto: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, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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)