



UPTOWN PLANNERS

UPTOWN PLANNERS: SPECIAL JULY MEETING MINUTES

DATE: 7/21/15

Call to order 6:09

By: Chair

Adoption of agenda: motion by Chris Ward, Jay Newington seconds. All in favor, chair abstains

Marlon's presentation:

Land Use Element

Reynard commercial area expanded, Five Points reduction, Mission Hills reduction, core of Hillcrest reduction, east Hillcrest density maintained, Bankers Hill reductions.

Incentive Zoning used to balance the reductions

Schedule:

October 2015 Public comment ends by November

April 2016 final EIR

May/June 2016 City Hearings

Public Comment:

Martin Flemming Bankers Hill: Current Banker's Hill development, have those been approved under new regulations?

Answer: no

No creativity about an emergency vehicle lane from 163 to Washington. Airport noise getting worse. Street crossings are dangerous in Bankers Hill. Difficulty getting into Medical area.

Ian Epley HCDC: List was sent to the Chair prior to the meeting. Community commercial 0-45 should be 0-54, residential 46-73, 30-45. Against historic districts. Supportive of several policies in DRAFT. Rewording of character and context.

Andrew Tan: Hillcrest. To downzone and then undo with density bonuses is dumb

Deborah Petri Mission Hills Heritage: Letter sent prior to meeting. Reynard Park not referred to consistently, it should be part of the plan. Density bonus concerns.

Nancy Moors: Bankers Hill Community Group: Reject City's density bonus

Ann Garwood: Bankers Hill, expresses lament for the reduction of 1 travel lane on 5th Ave. How can we add density?

Rick Wilson: Concern regarding height in east Hillcrest, preservation needed

Leo Wilson: MetroCDC supported downzone in Bankers Hill. Upzone is not needed in flight path or on First along canyon. The plan as presented is a good compromise

Donna Shampski: Bankers Hill: More density requires more infrastructure, parking

Rick: Density bonus needs more clarity, it needs a cap

Luke Terpstra: Hillcrest, character. HTC Letter provided to chair. Supportive of downzoning, not supportive of density bonuses

Terry Lenner: Bankers Hill, questions about process of public scoping meetings

Jim Frost: Bankers Hill, Infrastructure deficits are significant including water, sewer, storm, parkland, libraries and every public service. These need to be addressed before any new development is allowed.

Sharon Gehl: Mission Hills, climate change is a reality, we need sustainable development. Lower densities have resulted in very low growth. Bonuses are reasonable and necessary. Reynard Way has not developed since the last community plan update, further downzoning will be detrimental.

Caronly Rhett: Hillcrest, zoning includes 1 house per acre in canyons, concerned for open space.

Sharon Deirdralee: New housing tears down previously affordable housing. We are losing our historic character.

Kristin Harms: Univ. Heights, May 2013 workshop submitted to the City should be considered as her recommendation to the board.

Board Discussion:

Jay Newington cedes time to Tom Mullaney:

Mat Wahlstrom: Concerned about historical aspects and greater Hillcrest areas not being included in a Historical district. Marlon clarifies historical areas are only included on the west side of Hillcrest. Mat is against the density bonus and against new density allowed in this update.

Chris Ward: Open space should be strictly open space. Concerned with increased population projections, possible legal problem if population increases are not being correctly accounted for. Downzoning of Uptown may be problematic. It is good that we are updating our 30 year old plan. Hospital area should be an important part of the update.

Michael Brennan: Concerns about downzoning, driving growth to other areas. Supportive of density bonuses as long as they are responsive to local issues. Bonuses provide much needed community services. We need more housing and more affordable housing. Our business districts are struggling and need more people to live near them.

Dana Hook: Concerns about things changing, 30 years from now we must be able to work in new development, balance, choices for people who move into and within our neighborhood. Upzoning and higher densities must provide something in return by closing any loopholes. Land use and transportation go hand in hand.

Bob Daniel: LU-37 text missing from Mission Hills paragraph. Western Slopes group believe that the 30' height limit serves the community. Density bonus is unacceptable. We have an open space deficit, population growth problem and the density bonus is a problem.

Tom Mullaney: Comparison of 1988 community plan density for Hillcrest to the current one. The forecast population growth in this plan is too aggressive. Without the bonus density it might be manageable. List of pros and cons submitted to the board outlining significant disadvantages of the density bonus system.

Ernie Bonn: Disturbed about bonuses and affordable bonuses that could be used on top of the allowed bonuses. University Heights is vulnerable to North Park's projected growth. Ernie is concerned about future water needs and does not agree to any density bonuses within University Heights.

Beth Jaworski: Concerned about the process and it may be too late to influence this outcome now. It is time to talk about the next community plan update.

James Mellos: Concerned about increased density, reduced travel lanes, against density bonus.

Motion 1 by Bob Daniel: "Uptown Planners supports the recommendations of the Western Slopes Community Association, Mission Hills Heritage, Hillcrest Town Council, Five Points Business Improvement District, Bankers Hill Community Group and Metro San Diego Community Development Corporation with specific note of not supporting

density bonus, noting deficits of open space, infrastructure and supports height limits and densities commensurate with each neighborhood's existing historical character and quality of life as governed in the Community Plan. This motion applies to the entire Uptown Community Planning Area.”

Jennifer Pesqueira seconds

Discussion:

Chris Ward: question. Would we be at a disadvantage to other neighborhoods if we reject bonuses and they accept them? Marlon: Yes. Would we lose fees for new infrastructure? Marlon: Yes. Would any bonuses trigger discretionary review? Marlon: Yes. Would density be increased automatically if we reject the bonuses? Marlon: That is an option.

James Mellos: Question as to whether densities will increase if bonuses are lost.

Marlon: This is an alternative, not one he can speak to.

Tom Mullaney: Does not want to spend Uptown Planners time to review these discretionary projects into the foreseeable future.

Mat Wahlstrom: Existing bonuses have been wasted in years past and have been used as a backstop for the general fund.

Tom Fox enters at approximately 8:00 pm

Motion Passes 9/3/1 motion passes

(For: Beth Jaworski, Ken Tablang, Jennifer Pesqueira, Mat Wahlstrom, Tom Fox, Bob Daniel, Jay Newington, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney. Against: Chris Ward, Dana Hook, Michael Brennan. Chair Abstains)

Motion 2 by Tom Mullaney: “Uptown planners request that the City Planning Department calculate the buildout, including commercial and residential, if built to the maximum amount allowable, based on the draft Land Use Maps, not including the density bonus.”

Motion Passes 12/0/1

(For: Beth Jaworski, Ken Tablang, Jennifer Pesqueira, Mat Wahlstrom, Tom Fox, Bob Daniel, Jay Newington, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney, Chris Ward, Dana Hook, Michael Brennan. Chair Abstains)

Motion 3 by Ernie Bonn: Motion to re-affirm recommendation as submitted in May 16, 2013 workshop (language from Ernie), and approve no density bonus as reflected in the new plan for University Heights. Tom Mullaney seconds

Motion Passes 3/0/10

(For: Ken Tablang, Tom Mullaney, Ernie Bonn, 0 against, Beth Jaworski, Jennifer Pesqueira, Mat Wahlstrom, Tom Fox, Bob Daniel, Jay Newington, Chris Ward, Dana Hook, Michael Brennan, Chair Abstains)

Tom Mullaney amendment to reaffirm no bonuses for University Heights:
Withdrawn motion.

Motion 4 by Mat Wahlstrom: "That the Planning Department re-zone the area of Hillcrest east of the 163, south of Washington St, west of Park Blvd, and north of Essex St, to 0-44 Du/Ac for both residential and commercial rather than the 0-73 Du/Ac zoned for both in the draft."

Discussion:

Tom Mullaney: Supportive of Mat's motion

Chris Ward: This was already passed under previous board motion and is not supportive

Michael Brennan: The compromise of lowered density for west Hillcrest and higher density for east Hillcrest was the result of years of community dialogue and negotiations. To strip away this compromise is going too far and would be ignoring years of community input.

Dana Hook: Our motion previously passed already addresses this issue in the broader context.

Tom M seconds

Motion Fails 4/6/3

(For: Mat Wahlstrom, Ernie Bonn, Jay Newington, Tom Mullaney. Against: Michael Brennan, Chris Ward, Dana Hook, Ken Tablang, Tom Fox, Bob Daniel. Abstentions Chair, Beth Jaworski, Jennifer Pesquiera)

Mat W. motions to adjourn, Jennifer P. seconds
Adjourned at 8:28