



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Draft Minutes: Monday, August 4, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.

North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue

I. Parliamentary Items

A. Call to Order* 6:15 pm

Note: Rec Center personnel 30 minutes late in opening up room, despite having been called twice on 8/4/2014 and requested to have room open no later than 5:45 pm

Attendance:

Seated Board Members: Peter Hill, Dionne Carlson, Steve Codraro, Rick Pyles, Roger Morrison, Lucky Morrison, Sarah McAlear

Seated Community Subcommittee Members: Rene Vidales, Rob Steppke, Kitty Callen, Ernie Bonn

Others in Attendance: Vicki Granowitz, Paul (no last name), Don Leichtling,

B. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda Motion to adopt AgendaBonn /Callen, 11/0/0

C. Approval of Previous Minutes: July 7, 2014

Motion to Approve July 07, 2014 Minutes: Steppke/Bonn , 8/0/3

D. Announcements

Ernie: Uptown planners meeting information on new Mission Hills library - private funding precludes joint use

Rob: The North Park Maintenance Assessment District (MAD) is seeking candidates to fill a vacancy on the MAD board for a Residential Seat.

II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each). None

III. Action/Discussion

● **2447 Felton St. – Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) & Variance - Action**

The project requires a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) for single dwelling unit development on an individual lot that is less than or equal to 15,000 square feet and contains sensitive biological resources as described in Section 143.0110. Further, the project requires a Neighborhood Development Permit for construction of a privately owned structure proposed in the public right-of-

way dedicated for a street, where the applicant is the record owner of the underlying fee title as described in Sections 129.0710(a) and 129.0710(b)(2). The project also requires a Variance for proposed development that does not comply with the development regulations of the Land Development Code for the RS-1-1 underlying base zone. The deviations identified are for Floor Area Ratio and the required Front Yard Setback.

Presentation and discussion shown in Addenda

Motion:

To recommend approval of a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) for single dwelling unit development on an individual lot that is less than or equal to 15,000 square feet and contains sensitive biological resources as described in Section 143.0110; and a Neighborhood Development Permit for construction of a privately owned structure proposed in the public right-of-way dedicated for a street, where the applicant is the record owner of the underlying fee title as described in Sections 129.0710(a) and 129.0710(b)(2); and two variances/deviations: for proposed development that does not comply with the development regulations of the Land Development Code for the RS-1-1 underlying base zone for Floor Area Ratio; and for the required Front Yard Setback for the property located at 2447 Felton Street. Carlson/Vidales 11/0/0

- **North Park Community Plan Update (CPU) – Urban Design Element - Discussion**

Discussion shown in Addenda

- **North Park CPU – Urban Design Element – CPIOZ/Historic - Discussion**

Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones (CPIOZ) and their potential use in the North Park CPU to address historic preservation concerns.

Discussion shown in Addenda

- IV. Information None
- V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items None
- VI. Adjournment Motion to Adjourn: Steve D/Rene Vidales 11/0/0

Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Monday, September 8, 2014

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit northparkplanning.org or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at urbandesign@northparkplanning.org 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 August 19, 2014.

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



[NorthParkPlanning](#)



[@NPPlanning](#)

Addenda

2447 Felton St. – Discussion

Architect and owner presented:

Current zoning RS11 - canyon areas – new code allows a very small FAR - similar to RS 1-7 - 0.6 FAR – Seeking a variance on the FAR so as to have the same FAR as adjacent homes on the same street. FAR = Floor area ratio

3000 sq ft house on 5K sq ft lot

Requesting 0 ft front setback - more than 20 feet from PROW

Intrusion into setback required to get driveway to home because home on a steep downhill slope

Laurel is a paper street – Home design steps height downhill into canyon and retains the view corridor. Architecture is massed to break up block - articulated and stepped. Only garage & driveway require variances

Requesting 2 NDP's & 2 variances

Note: Last cycle report is in error – property is not on MHPA land.

Need variances for Intrusion into the PROW - & for setback – not for sensitive habitat

Public Comment:

Don L: If you don't get the variance - how will it affect the home design? Ans: It will push house further into canyon

Will the proposed front of the structure match adjacent properties? Ans: Yes.

Matt Barnhart: retaining wall in front of house- does the wall cross the access road

No it cannot cross the easement - easement will be maintained. City uses the access road.

Terry Goodbody: (Neighbor on Felton) What is in the canyon - how will the home impact the people on the other side

Ans: Just a wild canyon – distance is far to other side, no impacts to neighbors across the canyon.

Jane O'Brian: (Neighbor on Felton) Water meters are close to the paper street - how will this project impact access to the meters? Ans: The city has been cutting over private property - they will have to go around the private property and use the actual easement, but will still have easy access to the water meters. Q: What size is the retaining wall on the canyon.. Ans. Small retaining wall needed to support the hill slope – very small wall.

Alan Bennett: Most homes in the area are around 2k sq ft - you are asking for 3K, you are getting 50% more and asking for 0 lot line, how do you justify this?

Ans: Home is 2600K sq ft plus 300 sq ft garage - City staff agree home size is the same as /similar to that of the other homes on the street. Requesting to match driveway access and footprint of existing homes on street.

Matt: Concerned about canyon view from inside the canyon - people will be walking 10 feet (public foot path) from back of house . Ans: Path is 22 feet away from nearest wall- deck is raised - small and narrow part of the house is closest to canyon- design makes a substantial effort to retain views from both street and canyon.

Board Questions/Comments:

Rene V.: Is development on Environmentally Sensitive Land- Is a Water Quality Technical Report required for runoff and discharge? What mitigations are proposed? Ans: No, property is not in MHPA, first cycle report reference to MHPA is in error. We are doing a water quality study which will be included in 2nd submittal to City.

Steve C.: Explain significance markings on presentation board: Ans: red line= property line Straight white line shows PROW, Shapes in grey are footprints of adjacent structures, proposed driveway spanning PROW and setback is shown as white block – There are no sidewalks on the street.

Dionne C.: Given there are no community objections, supports deviations requested due to challenging nature of the site, the fact that deviations requested match footprints of adjacent homes, and the concerted design effort made to protect views and to be low impact. Please discuss any green and/or sustainable features of the design. Ans:: Design is Photovoltaic ready – still exploring options for solar, Design incorporates cross ventilation and passive energy usage (hoping not to need HVAC) – Design “fits gently on the land”

Ernie B: Always nervous about fire safety so close to canyon – what measures are being taken to ensure fire safety? Ans: Materials palette is all fire safe; i.e. stucco, not wood, non-flammable decking as required by City (requirements have changed substantially in the last 5 years) succulent landscaping where not left natural.

Lucky M.: Is property shown across the street on presentation board (shown: a satellite view of the area with various setbacks marked on it) a single family home? It appears to be very large. Ans: Yes, it is a single home

Q: When other homes on the street were built - were these all empty canyon lots? - Answer - Yes - All the existing homes were built on designated single family lots that go down into the canyon. This project is proposed for a single-family zoned lot. Deviations are required to do exactly what the other homes have done because the regulations have changed since they were built.

Peter H: So are the issues identified in the assessment letter resolved? Ans: Yes, Adjacency issues will be complied with and water runoff report will be provided in the next submission.

North Park Community Plan Update (CPU) – Urban Design Element

Overview from Chair Hill:

Note proposed urban design features in Encanto’s CPU: lessons to learn for North Park?

Commercial / Residential use compatibility: draft design guidelines from Planning Dept.

Paul: bad idea - should be site specific - should not be able to trade density from one area to another. Equivalent of carbon trading. developers could swap units credits, monetizing air rights, etc..

Terry Goodbody – This idea caused some strange designs in Portland, but can have advantages - High rises with nice parkland - gathered rights from around allowing one person to go up 10 stories=

Kathy Morrison : Very concerned about recent reductions of parking requirement - big concern as we already have a parking deficit in North Park (a residential parking district is being considered because of the problem) City should require one space per bedroom.

Sarah M.- difference between allowed density and zoning - needs clarification

Steve C- SF bay area/ 1/2 Moon Bay declared a moratorium on sewer permits – this created a black market for sewer permits overnight. Echo Paul’s sentiment – should be a discretionary process –

Allowing landowners to purchase development rights is simply an attorney's "full employment act" - too good to be true - way too complex to be that simple.

Ernie: Reference Clairement & Bay Park - Hue and cry there over increased ministerial density- this won't go over very well - height concerns - Outlying areas are restricted by height, makes no sense to place height in the middle.

Rob: Not opposed to the concept in theory – seen it done successfully in other cities - but... has serious concern about implementation & process. City of SD has poor track record of not following its own rules and processes.

Lucky: Time for a serious Conversation about role developers play in planning in San Diego (BIA regularly writes City Codes and sets land use policy) - City of villages sounded good but hasn't worked - don't buy that we have to accept density along the trolley lines – We don't have to accept the kind of density they are asking for, and they haven't yet proved that we can expect that level of population growth.

Rick - ditto Lucky – Density should be traded for quality of life benefits via a discretionary process.

Rene- Density transfers are very complex and very hard to track – No guarantee that loopholes won't be written into the code and new will be required bureaucracy to track transfers, adding another level of taxpayer expense.

Vicki - City of Villages concept was flawed, and has not worked well...except in North park, where we preserved the historic "village" we had. The NPMS model for "city of villages" has worked - but we had to fight for it!

Chair Hill: Introduced discussion on new Parking changes at City: Is a reduced parking ratio appropriate, given that NP is already in a transit overlay zone? Shared parking agreements will be allowed . Remove Parking from FAR?

Don: Parking structures should have roof be an urban park. We have a shortage of Open space. Could dedicate first floor accessible as open space to be allowed to build higher. Reduction in parking requirements for new development affects infill negatively - affects entire street negatively.

Allen Bennet: 1975 these were done and were a dismal failure - NO parking on the first floor - the most hostile environment is a parking lot - don't let developers snow you - First floor should be retail-activated - Seattle tower - reference - 2) 250/sq ft for a parking space - 25 employees on average - in 5k sq ft bldg - you can buy-down with carpools, transit subsidy, locker rooms with showers - 67K/ underground parking stall.

Vicki- likes shared parking - unsure of particulars. Likes Paseo's open space and plaza like Little Italy. Internal recreational uses are still good in a large residential development - even if they aren't open to the public - need both ways. Want underground parking to be a requirement.

Ernie- Parking Advisory bd. - letter to Mayor requesting maximizing the use of parking in public structures on public land - Parking should not just be restricted to employees, but be available to the public day and night.

Lucky – Likes what has been done downtown at County Admin bldg- huge parking lot – Idea of a park over/on top of parking is wonderful :- good use

Rick: Shared parking - where are the large lots to share with development? - how will this be implemented? Devil is in the details.

Rene: lots of elements to consider - this is a confusing mixed salad.

Dionne: Agree with Paul and Steve on Density – should be site specific & always discretionary – no handing out profitable increased density to developers magisterially. Especially in older infrastructure-deficient areas like North Park. It is important to require community benefits in return for that extra profit & for the projects to be discretionary so community Plan guidelines can be enforced (don't trust the City to enforce, given the track record) . Agree parking should go on 2nd floor/3rd floor & above - keep ground floor for retail. And agree Parking requirements should not be reduced for ministerial projects – less parking could be permitted via a discretionary permit depending on the community requested benefits/concessions provided by the developer (i.e. adaptive re-use of a historic building, rooftop gardens with pre-installed solar & bike parking, etc.) - CPG's should have the discretion to do this on discretionary permits.

North Park CPU – Urban Design Element – CPIOZ/Historic

Chair Hill presented concepts from Howard Blackson and from Uptown Planners.

Howards concept is layering - lot layers. Howard suggests appropriate uses at appropriate layer

Layer One = frontage - from the property line to 20 feet in

Layer Two = semi-public - ie medical office

Layer Three = parking and less desirable uses – keep these in back - keeps activity on the street

Public Comment:

Kathy: Sounds great in concept – But how do we make development/Developers conform? (reference Jack in the Box) - how will these be implemented and enforced?

Paul- Masonary walls be full height of structure and have no openings?

Don: What separates where you will do this and where you won't - mid block or corner? Residential or commercial?

Allen B: Developers want to build to max heights, don't want to get variance - condos on top with retail underneath.

Vicki - Howards B comments- intended for suburban locations -not meant for our type of urban location.

Don: Parking in back of lot ends up with long driveway - uses up lot - unless you have alley.

Board Comment:

Rene- Howard's concept is being implemented everywhere north of University Ave – parking is on alley – This is Good usage where there are alleys, more problematic where there are not.

Steve: In lieu of recommended fixes - Require site plan showing 4 surrounding uses - make permits Discretionary - suggest policy for quality design

Kitty - agree with Steve

Roger - agree with Rene

Dionne: Like the Uptown design Guidelines with perhaps a couple of tweaks and additions– these should apply to ALL Ministerial projects in North Park. Like Howard's design guidelines where there are alleys.

Ernie: lights are often invasive - implement lighting sensitivity to adjacent properties - put into lighting element - create lighting guidelines – green, dark sky, sensitive to light pollution of neighboring properties

Rob Steppke – Support the Uptown draft guidelines for ministerial projects- and would go further . Agree with Rene - Howards concept doesn't apply well where there are no alley .

Lucky - Where have they done it right? -Whole Foods in Hillcrest is a good example - parking on top - use entire top level for parking and community events- doesn't require a roof - doesn't need a roof on top, but could cover with pergola and solar panels.

Rick - like Howard's concept for some areas (where there are alleys), but must include the Uptown Design Guidelines too.

Sarah: Concerned about Light reflection off of giant buildings (yes address in Lighting element) , placement of drive-thru's properly on site – i.e. rethink curb cut rules so that they make sense.

Discussion of Historic Element:

George Frank from North Park Historical Society presented NPHS suggestions on how to incorporate historic preservation guidelines into CPIOZ.

CPIOZ - Survey and NP Hist. Soc want to maintain the existing historic districts and add new ones

CPIOZ - community plan implementation overlay zone

How do you protect districts until they are formed and their own guidelines are in place? – by using CPIOZ

East/West streets have relatively small bungalows - lot of non-conforming houses

CPIOZ criteria include things like only 2 floors - lots of homes sit close to street - retain the character should allow differences in those zones in a CPIOZ.

Use CPIOZ to retain mid-century character

Kathy - how do you (NPHS) pick a neighborhood to look at for a historic district? - George - ask us (NPHS)

Don – Why is this only discussed at the end of the meeting, should be up front - 29th street - IDM – should be a development moratorium - cinderblock walls - Can we have a historic district on both sides of 30th street including Ray street?

Steve: objective or subjective = subjective

Ernie - Suggest look at historic street car routes - like 395 – as the basis for a district

Sarah: Spalding place

Dionne: How can we use the CPIOZ Overlay zone to protect existing historic windows in potentially historic properties? Especially in small bungalows that could be contributing to districts, but may not be individually historic? This is an ongoing problem with negative impact to community character in all neighborhoods: Folks who want to demo a building remove the original wood windows (City does not require a permit for this) and then claim the property is no longer historic because it doesn't have its original windows and is not intact! Catch 22. How do we create design guidelines within the various CPIOZ zones to protect the community character and historic charm of North Park where an area may not qualify as a historic district? City should be working on this.