



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Committee
August 4, 2009, Tuesday – Meeting Minutes

Present: Grinchuk, Gatzke, Liddell, Lamb, Seidel, Hyde, Dahl, Wilson (Chair), Bonn, Gottschalk, Edwards, Adler, O'Dea, Towne. Mellos and Jaworski arrived late (see below.)

Absent: Wendorf

Marlon Pangilinan of CPCI was present; Rob Steppke, the chair of the North Park Planning Group was also present.

I. Board Meeting: Parliamentary Items/ Reports

Approval of Agenda

Dahl moved to approve agenda. Motion passed by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

After corrections, Seidel moved to approve the June minutes with Bonn seconding. Motion passed by voice vote.

Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Dahl reported a balance of \$199.28.

Website Report

O'Dea gave the website report, inviting people to check out the redesigned site at www.uptownplanners.org.

Chair/CPC Report

Chair Wilson reported that the CPC had an ad hoc subcommittee working with planning staff on the preparation of the Community Plan Preparation Manual. The subcommittee, after reviewing the memorandum prepared by Don Liddell, had questions regarding the application of City Council Policy 600-24, which were referred to the City Attorney.

Also, the CPC will be considering the SANDAG 2050 growth projections at its September meeting, which will be used to determine future density and transportation policies for the region.

The CPC attempted to get one of its members, Brooke Peterson, the chair of the Clairemont Planning Group, appointed to a SANDAG advisory committee on future transportation policy. Peterson, who is chair of the Urban Land Institute, was not appointed, nor were any other representative from the Mid-City neighborhoods – instead the advisory committee was heavily made up of individuals from suburban communities. The CPC felt this made it unrepresentative of the urban communities located in the City of San Diego.

Public Communication – Non-Agenda Public Comment:

Carol Shultz of Uptown Partnership said that the Partnership was working with council districts 2 and 3 to determine the composition of a larger Partnership board. The Partnership finance committee was recommending three additional board members. One each would represent council districts 2 and 3. The third would represent Uptown Planners.

(Board member Mellos arrived.)

Joyce Summers of CCDC, and past chair of the Downtown Planning Group, reported that the State of California planned to raid CCDC's redevelopment money. How much would be lost wasn't yet known.

She also announced the formation of a new committee to address creating a homeless shelter, and said that the San Diego Housing Commission would be involved in the process.

Board member Gottschalk said that the condition of streets and sidewalks in Uptown was deplorable, and that it was unfair that all the resources for maintaining infrastructure were being used downtown at the expense of other neighborhoods in San Diego.

(Board member Jaworski arrived.)

Representatives of Elected Officials::

Nick Norvell, representing Congresswoman Susan Davis, spoke about her most recent activities.

Joe Kocurek, representing Assemblywoman Lori Saldana, spoke about her most recent activities.

Consent Agenda: None

Information Items: Projects:

1. Old Town Heritage Park

OLD TOWN HERITAGE PARK MASTER PLAN IMPROVEMENTS – County of San Diego – Old Town Planning Area – Proposed development would include the construction of four new Victorian style structures, renovation of seven existing historic structures, modification of landscaping, and other minor site improvements including pedestrian benches, additional lighting, trees, and fire pits, on a 5.1 acre site bordered by Juan Street, Heritage Park Road and Harvey Street. Project location is on the border with, and may include areas within, the Uptown Community Planning Area.

Fred Grand, on behalf of the applicant, the Hacienda Hotel, made the presentation of the proposed project. The project is in its conceptual stage, as the County of San Diego, the underlying land owner, has just contracted with the applicant to move forward with the project. The City of San Diego will have to approve any project on the site.

Neighbors and community members who spoke included the following residents of the adjacent neighborhood: Stuart White, Linda Smith, Kent Stubb, KC Claffy, Jessica Quernell, Rob Coppedge, and Timothy Dunnigan; Rick Wilson of Hillcrest, and Charles Harris of Bankers Hill/Park West also commented. The speakers raised concerns at the project's large size and scale, lack of community notification and input, possible parking and traffic issues, and impact on wildlife in an adjoining canyon. Concerns were also expressed about whether the design of the new structures would be compatible with the historic buildings located in Heritage Park; and the apparent disrepair of the existing buildings.

Karen Spring, speaking in favor of the project, said that the potential parking problems were overstated. Jeanne Ferrell also spoke in favor of the project. Richard Stegner, who works in Old Town, also commented.

Carl Harry, speaking for the County of San Diego (which was in a public-private partnership with the applicant) said that the county liked the proposal and saw it as a potential model for other public-private partnerships at a time when public money was in short supply.

Neighbor Richard Baker said that he didn't see parking as an issue, but that the applicant needed to do more to reach out to the community. Many in the neighborhood had not heard about the project.

Fred Grand, responded to the issue raised, and stated that the project came about because the county had allowed the park and its buildings to deteriorate. The applicant said that it was open to design suggestions, and that the large scale of the new structures had been initially proposed because the county wanted to see what the impact of the largest possible buildings for purposes of environmental review. The applicant said that 41 parking spaces would be dedicated to Heritage Park, including some at the Hacienda

Hotel. As for other parking and traffic issues, it was up to the City of San Diego to address them as it saw fit. Finally, the applicant said that it was putting \$9 million into the project.

2. Mission Hills Water Main Replacement:

MISSION HILLS GROUP 665 WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT (PINE STREET, AMPUDIA STREET, FT. STOCKTON DRIVE AND LEWIS STREET) – Water Main Replacement – Mission Hills -- The project will replace 4,895 linear feet of existing 8-inch to 18-inch water pipelines, consisting of cast iron (CI) and asbestos cement (AC) water mains. These water pipelines will be constructed at 3-8 feet in depth, to be replaced-in-place along with all other work and appurtenances. The water main replacement will be done in 2 phases and high-lined in order to minimize impacts to water demands and construction delays. Contractor will construct/lay the mains using open trench method. Construction will also include the installation of curb ramps and street resurfacing

The applicant (City of San Diego) made a presentation and answered questions.

Action Items: Project:

1. Saint Paul's Manor land-use amendment and rezone:

2640/2654 FOURTH AVENUE (“ST. PAUL’S MANOR PROJECT PLAN AMENDMENT INITIATION REQUEST”) – **Initiation Request to Prepare Draft Plan Amendment** – Bankers Hill/Park West – Initiation of a proposed amendment to Uptown Community Plan which would re-designate the subject site at 2640/2654 from Office Residential 44--73 dwelling units per acre to Mixed-Use 73—110 dwelling units per acre. The proposed amendment, if initiated, would be evaluated along with the other land use issues identified with the initiation request, and processed concurrently with an application for a rezone and other entitlements

Marlon Pangilinan made a presentation on behalf of CPCI in support of the initiation of the proposed community plan amendment. If the initiation was approved by the Planning Commission on September 3, the draft amendment would be processed along with the project submittal, and subject to review by Uptown Planners..

Richard Ledford, representing St. Paul’s Manor, stated that an "additional community benefit" would be required by the requested rezone, which would result in the project being of a larger scale and higher density than the current zoning allows. The additional benefit would include an increase in available senior housing; an increase in commercial activity in a "commercially-challenged" area; additional public facilities for the community (available to non-resident seniors), and additional contributions by the developer for needed public facilities. He noted that the project, already shown to Uptown Planners as an informational item in November 2008, had not changed. Instead, the applicant and the city had determined that the project would require a rezone through a community plan amendment, because it had more density than allowed by the existing office/mixed use zoning.

Mel Penner and Charles Harris, residents of Cambridge Square, expressed concern that the neighbors had not been given time to consider the proposed community plan initiation; and that a rezone would amount to an end-run around the pending community plan update. They also stated that the units were larger than needed, that a six story building was too massive for the neighborhood the building is located. The rezone would set a bad precedent that would open the door to other out-of-scale projects in the vicinity. Jeannie Rawlings indicated concerns over several design aspects of the project.

Ledford, on behalf of the applicant, responded that it did not have the financial resources to wait for the community plan update, that the great majority of units were from 1100 to 1500 square feet in size, and that the money that was made by the project would be used to help seniors in other facilities.

At the suggestion of the chair, the applicant declined to agree to a continuance of the initiation request, which would have required the September 3rd Planning Commission hearing date be continued.

Liddell moved to approve, stating the request was only to initiate a draft community plan amendment; which would be subject to discretionary approval when the project was reviewed by Uptown Planners. Seidel seconded. The motion was subject to the condition that the applicant work with the local community on the design of the project; and provide a special benefit to the community above the required DIF. It was recommended that the special benefit should be a contribution to the development of the proposed Olive Street Park.

Gottschalk, seconded by Mellos, made a substitute motion to continue the item to the September agenda. The substitute motion failed 5,10,1. Gottschalk, Hyde, Edwards, Bonn and Mellos voted in favor: Liddell, Seidel, Lamb, Adler, Dahl, Gatzke, Grinchuk, Jaworski, O'Dea, Towne voting against. Chair Wilson abstained.

Liddell's motion was then voted on and passed 8,7,1. Liddell, Seidel, Lamb, Grinchuk, Gatzke, Dahl, O'Dea, Jaworski voting in favor. Edwards, Gottschalk, Bonn, Adler, Towne, Mellos and Hyde voted against. Chair Wilson abstained.

2. Paseo de Mission Hills proposed loading zone.

PASEO DE MISSION HILLS PROJECT LOADING ZONE (FORT STOCKTON DRIVE) – Mission Hills – Proposal to place a loading zone on the south side of Fort Stockton Drive between Falcon Street and Goldfinch Street, in place of two metered parking spaces

Jeremy Joyce made the presentation on behalf of the applicant. Carol Schultz indicated that Uptown Partnership would review the proposal at its September meeting.

O'Dea, seconded by Mellos, moved to deny, saying that the proposed loading zone would take away two existing public parking spaces and that the applicant should explore other alternatives -- including the originally proposed garage entry.

Motion passed 10,5,1. Mellos, O’Dea, Adler, Hyde, Grinchuk, Lamb, Jaworski, Bonn, Dahl, Liddell voted in favor. Edwards, Towne, Gottschalk, Seidel and Gatzke voted against. Chair Wilson abstained.

3. Request for letter of support for the Wine Lovers Outdoor Theater:

REQUEST FOR LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR AN OUTDOOR THEATER AT “THE WINE LOVER” – Hillcrest – Request to the City Council that “The Wine Lover”, located at 3968 Fifth Avenue, be allowed to provide outdoor movie entertainment to the Hillcrest/ Uptown community. This request is made pursuant to the recommendation passed by Uptown Planners at its May 5, 2009 meeting to permit outdoor movie theaters in non-residential areas of Uptown.

Board member and applicant Grinchuk recused himself from voting on the matter. As the applicant, Grinchuk spoke of why he was seeking the ability to have an outdoor theater. Chair Wilson spoke on behalf of approving the letter; pointing out the board had approved a similar letter of support for the TOPS Outdoor Theater in Mission Hills earlier in 2009.

Gatzke, seconded by Jaworski, moved to approve. Motion passed 14,0,1,1. Chair Wilson abstained; Board member Grinchuk recused himself.

Subcommittee Reports:

Historic Resources Subcommittee: Demolition Policy Concerns; Discussion of concerns, contained in a subcommittee report dated July 26, 2009, about the City of San Diego’s current demolition policies. Discussion may result in possible recommendations to the Land Use & Housing Subcommittee of the City Council, which will be discussing the issues in September.

O’Dea discussed the ongoing un-noticed and otherwise improper demolitions of potentially historic structures in Uptown.

Community member (and Uptown Design Review Subcommittee member) Ian Epley expressed concern over what he characterized as an apparent intent by many to save every bungalow and craftsman structure in Uptown regardless of whether or not such structures had been historically designated.

Gatzke suggested continuing the discussion of the item until the September agenda; which would provide time for board members to review the document. The board agreed with the suggestion.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 p.m.

The minutes respectfully submitted by board member Andrew Towne.