

**North Park Planning Committee
Urban Design/Project Review Subcommittee
Monday, August 4, 2008 at 6:00 PM
North Park Recreation Center/Adult Center (2719 Howard Street)**

Draft Meeting Minutes

NPPC Members Attending (7): Judith O'Boyle, Rob Steppke, Kitty Callen (6:15), Carl Moczydlowsky, Keoni Rosa, Rene Vidales, Liz Studebaker (6:15). *Stephen Whitburn in attendance, but not seated due to NPPC majority.*

Community Members Attending (2): Vicki Granowitz (Left 7:39), Ernie Bonn

Parliamentary Items

1. Call to Order, Roll Call – Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.
2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – Previous meeting minutes approved with incorporated revision to the spelling of “size”. (Bonn/Steppke) 6-0-1 (Moczydlowsky abstain)
3. Requests for Additions or Re-Ordering of Agenda – NONE

Non-Agenda Public Comment

Michael Holmes for Arbor Terrace Alliance

The Arbor Terrace Alliance requests the Urban Design/Project Review Subcommittee and/or the North Park Planning Committee to notify them if the developers of Arbor Terrace request modifications. The Alliance is looking to reopen alley access issues. Contact list provided.

Ernie Bonn for Uptown Planners

Modification to height limits ordinances passed by City Council via consent agenda.

Uptown Planners will vote on taking a position of support for Greater North Park and the North Park Planning Committee letter in opposition of the Mayor's office's proposed changes to the Mills Act.

Urban Design

1. **Academy of Our Lady of Peace Expansion and Modernization. 4860 Collier, 2710 and 2746 Copley, 4910 Ulvada Place. Project Number 130619.** A PDP, SDP, and CUP to amend CUP/Resource Protection Ordinance Permit 92-0769. The project involves an update to the Master Plan, an EIR, and an amended CUP allowing enrollment to 750. The initial project proposed that AOLP would construct a two story classroom and lab building and parking structure. Deviations are sought for setback, parking, building height. RS 1-7 and RS 1-1 zones in transit overlay zone within the Greater North Park Community Plan. The presentation will focus on changes made to the project proposal since the May 5 information item. Representing the applicant are Trish Butler and Megan Tunney.

Judi O'Boyle, Chair, stated that the draft meeting minutes would be forwarded to the Environmental Planner so that they can be incorporated as part of the public response to the Draft EIR. Comments must be received by August 23, 2008.

Trish Butler and Megan Tunney, representing AOLP, presented a response to issues raised at the May 5 UD/PR Subcommittee meeting. A handout describing outreach efforts and design evolution was distributed.

Issues covered:

- Design iteration of the classroom building resulting in a representation of the mission style residences with articulation to portray a separate structure that is more compatible with the existing residential structures.
- Parking structure to replicate the residential mission style with a single below grade level and a single at-grade level. More articulation and detail has been added to the parking lot wall. The three level parking structure option has been carried forward as an alternative because the two level structure would result in a deviation of parking requirements by 10 spaces. AOLP indicated that the city has stated that it supports the deviation of the parking requirement; therefore, AOLP's preference is for the two level structure.
- AOLP has distributed its monthly newsletter to neighbors with return postcard about traffic improvements. Survey responses indicated overwhelming support for the project.
- AOLP described its outreach efforts on traffic, parking, and master plan. They showed a timeline of efforts since July 2006.

The UD/PR Subcommittee members asked the following questions and made the following statements (*AOLP answers are in italics*):

- Vidales:
 - What are the traffic management plan mitigation measures in respect to community concerns?
 - *Four active traffic management personnel direct traffic and enforce rules during peak times. Officers are trained by a third party and certified by SDPD.*
 - *OLP has identified problem areas and addressed them but acknowledges there are other issues.*
- Bonn:
 - Have you considered two underground levels of parking?
 - *No, but that is something to look at.*
 - Please explain the parking counts.
 - *104 parking spots required, 94 proposed. OLP indicates that City traffic engineering has certified the count and is comfortable with the minor deviation.*
 - *City's parking formula, based on student enrollment, takes staff members into account.*
 - Why is there nothing about water and energy conservation?
 - *Unanswered due to time constraints or lack of answers*
 - Why did the EIR not consider a Satellite campus?
 - *Unanswered due to time constraints or lack of answers*
 - The judicial order and decisions should have been included in the Draft EIR.
- Callen:
 - Offsite parking is a good idea.
- Studebaker:
 - The design and development process is lacking in community involvement. The issue of the CUP violations is a major consideration.

- Granowitz:
 - Upset that the land use issues weren't addressed adequately and an architect is needed for future presentations. Felt that the same presentation was given at previous meetings without addressing issues. Concerned about the historic preservation. Doesn't like the blue metal wrought iron. Doesn't believe that the survey results are valid due to sampling methodology.

- Steppke:
 - What is the change in setback from the street for the classroom building?
 - *Iteration 1: minimum setback (~10 ft)*
 - *Iteration 2: more than the minimum required setbacks.*
 - *Current Iteration: more than Iteration 2.*
 - Why were the survey cards not addressed residents to north of Adams Avenue (as described in the OLP handout)
 - *Survey cards did go north of Adams Avenue from Arizona to Kansas.*

- Rosa:
 - Has the classroom building been analyzed for the potential for underground parking?
 - *Unanswered due to time constraints or lack of answers*

- O'Boyle:
 - Why is there no consideration of adaptive reuse of historical resources? Why can't the historic resources be reused?
 - *There is a misconception that the historic structures aren't currently being utilized. They are and don't meet the needs or demands of the expansion. The modernization and expansion goal is to create new space for educational purposes.*
 - Do you have areas and facilities that are available for the general community, as a community benefit? Does the community get to use the AOLP facilities for no charge? Is the chapel used for religious services (such as Friday, Saturday, Sunday Mass) that are open to the public.
 - *Wedding ceremonies have taken place—not certain if the wedding parties are or have been affiliated with the school alumni or donors*
 - Why is OLP attempting to get on the Planning Commission agenda in September (as stated in the Summer OLP Newsletter) without action from UD/PR and the NPPC. The NPPC will not agendaize the project for action until the community comments/responses to the Draft Final EIR are made available sometime after the August 23 response deadline.
 - *It will be many months before there is a final EIR for the project and OLP will need to go to the Planning Commission before the final there is a final EIR.*

- Moczydlowsky:
 - What is the timing of the landscaping as presented in the visual simulations? What will the landscaping look like at maturity and at installation?
 - *Unanswered due to time constraints or lack of answers*
 - Cumulative impacts for water quality issues were inadequately addressed in the EIR considering increased encroachment and use of the canyon.
 - *Unanswered due to time constraints or lack of answers*

In reference to the violation of the existing CUP. OLP is sorry, feels like they blew it. They are not a developer and are not used to dealing with permits and conditions. The perception of violation as intentional isn't accurate. They are now in compliance with the administrative order and the CUP except with respect to the quantity of students. Even if new CUP is approved OLP will have to pay the fine for excess students.

COMMUNITY OPPOSITION COMMENT – a list of presenters and attendees in opposition was collected.

Clyde Turner – The two level parking structure is 10 spaces short. The plan requires the demolition of two important historic homes and this is unacceptable to the community. In addition, the neighborhood is losing seven street parking spaces. OLP is applying to change the CUP retroactively that they are in violation of. They have several violations including maximum staff of 46, 640 students, 106 parking, improper entry loop, and traffic violations. Change of density was declared a public nuisance. Police offers issued 20 citations the day before the administrative order.

Dionne Carlson – new project doesn't address or comply with the NP Community Plan. Community outreach is short-sighted and OLP won't talk face to face. Casa Encantada, one of the residences to be demolished is of significant historic interest—it is an important part of the community character. OLP keeps encroaching on the residential neighborhood and the existing residences that were purchased by the school create a buffer—if they are demolished that buffer is gone. The proposed master plan dramatically erodes community character as residences are demolished and replaced with a parking structure and an institutional building. Traffic issues have been mitigated but off site parking has not been implemented.

Dan Sullivan – lives in the residence next to Casa Encantada. He believes OLP is turning their backs on the community, believes that the revised plan is nothing more than a façade on the original plan and there has been no attempt to dialogue with the community or to make any compromises. Traffic and transportation is a serious issue. OLP frequently doesn't open the existing parking areas during events. Neighbors opposing the project have been threatened. Traffic funnels to single location and the project is under parked.

Martin Chevalier – egregious and woeful violation of the CUP. OLP is not cooperative with community and community would be more supportive if OLP would be cooperative. Chevalier presented an alternate plan for adaptive reuse and proposed parking on Adams. The OLP Plan did not include the community input in the early stages of design.

Ross Lopez – thinks the “gift” of fast-tracking the EIR and the CUP update is a violation of the California Constitution. Concerned about the unlimited number of staff. Parking is problematic and there should be staff parking in the plan.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT COMMENT - a list of presenters and attendees in support was collected.

Diane Carlson – has children that are students at OLP, husband Patrick is teacher in Escondido. Carlson is a nurse at trauma centers and traffic, safety and religion are important to her. OLP has done a great job in managing the traffic. The drop off and pick up times are much safer and the traffic coordinators have the lines of traffic organized.

Iliana Moreno – Traffic is not as bad as others have said. Thinks OLP is an asset to the community.

Raejean Laughter – OLP alumni, engineer, supports OLP on the grounds that it gives girls opportunities to succeed in life.

Gaby Strickland – alumnae and parent, emotional about OLP as part of the community and family. Discrediting the surveys is unfair and saddening. Feels it discredits the efforts of supporters as disingenuous.

Announcements and New Business

Adjournment (Steppe/Vidales_7:58)

Please speak only when recognized by the Chair. Be respectful of others and their ideas. Listen and be open-minded. No interruptions or side conversations. Stay focused on issues rather than personalities. Times listed are estimates only. For information about this committee please contact Judi O'Boyle at 619 283-2690 or joboyle@ucsd.edu

The next meeting of the North Park Planning Committee is July 15, 2008, 6:30 pm at the North Park Christian Fellowship (2901 North Park Way nr 30th Street).