



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

Public Workshop

Draft Minutes: May 29, 2014– 6:30 PM

www.northparkplanning.org

info@northparkplanning.org

Like us:  [NorthParkPlanning](https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning) Follow us:  [@NPPlanning](https://twitter.com/NPPlanning)

I. **Call to order:** 6:35 pm

II. **Attendance Report:** *Special Meetings and Workshops do not count against absence totals.*

Member	Robert Barry	Roger Morrison	Dionne Carlison	Daniel Gebreselassie	Vicki Granowitz	Peter Hill	Brandon Hilpert	Rachel Levin	Carl Moczydlowsky	Lucky Morrison	Dang Nguyen	Kevin Clark	Rick Pyles	Sarah McAlear	Steve Codraro
Attendance		1	12		2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9	10	11
Late			6:48												
Absences									1						

III. **Modifications to and Adoption of the 05/29/2014 Agenda**

a. **Motion to adopt May 29, 2014 NPPC Agenda**

IV. **Non Agenda Public Comment & Announcements**

a. **Don Lieighting** –asks attendees to sign up for his email list

V. **Discussion/Action Items**

a. **Edge Area – Commercial Transition Areas**

i. **30th St corridor south of North Park Way**

1. Single family homes that retain building for adaptive reuse

- a. Rick P – does not support; is concerned that the city’s vision is very different from the community’s vision
- b. Dionne – CPOZ would require adaptive reuse of these areas.
- c. Rachel – Doesn’t like the idea, is concerned about the late night (drink/entertainment) issues and parking concerns.
- d. Lucky – Not in support. Raised issues regarding notice of impacted residents.
- e. Brandon – Support of adaptable recuse, but wants to make sure that the CPOZ is enforced more effectively.
- f. Vicki – Is sensitive for the issues of commercial encroaching into the residential areas. But against due to the impact.
- g. Sarah – Is in support, but wants it to be used in very small areas where there are already existing noise related issues. Would like to propose it more for areas where there are already existing compatible impacts.
- h. Kevin – Wants to lessen impacts of business on residential areas, however isn’t sure if the need is there. So is against the current proposal.
- i. Roger – The problem we’re trying to solve doesn’t exist along the whole stretch, so he doesn’t support the plan as drawn up. But supports adaptive reuse
- j. Peter – Shared names of people who had emailed opposing it, added it does not support it as presented. (VICKI read list of names who also did not support.)
- k. Dang – Supporting adaptive reuse, but not in this situation.
- l. Steve – Doesn’t see the proposal creating a buffer, sees it removing a buffer. Didn’t see a problem that needed to be solved, was afraid this would allow for

- m. JOHN ANDERSON – Supports it tentatively. Wanted to know if it was a 2 year vs 20 year proposal. Likes the idea of adding flexibility. Believes that 5-20 years down the road, this could make sense.
 - n. Carl Leibold – East side 29th. Insulted it was called a buffer zone, if anything, would want the buffer to be moved to 30th. Adaptive use, current zoning is rather liberal and is concerned that it wouldn't limit usage.
 - o. Ed – Against, appreciates the board's efforts. Is concerned that for the next several years there would be a checker board of residents/biz
 - p. Kathy Morrison – Ray street. Opposed repeats the previous two. Would like to limit the use of 30th street. Would ask the board to stop more liquor etc.
 - q. Don Leighting – Put forth the idea that it would be a historic/artistic neighborhood, but it's no where in the plan. In favor of a no more than 2 stories on 30th street issues. Would like to suggest that there's at least a 30 day notice period.
 - r. Brook Embey – moved here due to the highly desirable neighborhood and the historic aspects, the idea of having non-professional businesses moving in. Would like to focus on the sidewalk issues along 30th. Against.
 - s. Rob Stepkke – Arizona St. Doesn't see what the buffering would achieve, but is in favor of adaptive reuse, but wants to see both sizes of the street fall under the same plan. Distrustful of the city of this were to pass. Against
 - t. Bob Muller – Question about usage – user would have to buy or lease and then make the changes. Is opposed.
 - u. Rick Donaldson – Thorn St. Is concerned with the Upas St issues as impacted by this plan. Doesn't trust the idea now since there is lots of vagueness related to the plan.
 - v. The whole audience raised their hands to voice opposition.
- 2. Limited commercial/retail uses
 - 3. No increases to height or density

MOTION: The NPPC strongly opposes a buffer zone for the 30th street corridor including the areas specified on the map as Ray, 29th and Upas Streets. Rick Piles/Roger Morrison. 11-0-1

ii. Specific Design Guidelines - Four "Geographic Areas" needing individual design treatments

- 1. Vons Grocery – 30th and Howard Avenue
- 2. Albertsons Grocery – University & Mississippi
- 3. 30th & El Cajon Blvd
- 4. Texas & El Cajon Blvd
 - a. Annete Flemming – CPIOZ questions. Specifically YouGotMail building. How did it get made without community impact/notifications?
 - b. Lucky – Raises issues related to notifications.
 - c. Rachel – Confirmed CPIOZ allow a community to review the project if it falls under category b. For CPIOZ A, it's assumed it's pretty black and white and allows or denies usage for planners.
 - d. Paul Spears – Louisiana. Commercial transition zones. 44 properties, 39 of which are contributing properties to historical (but not in a historic district).
 - e. Deborah Hill – Why would you change the SFH when some areas aren't being used fully now. Wants to keep the single family homes.
 - f. Tera Vessels – 30th/Redwood. Wants to point that CPIOZ is not down-zoning. Is afraid that we're in a slippery slope to get rid of old houses. Don't tear down existing houses.
 - g. Bob – North Parker, how did that get through the process with the addition of cell towers at the top.
 - h. Rene Vidales – Who decides what is in type a vs b CPIOZ. How will DSD know what the rules are and follow them properly? Design review proves for CPIOZ/design review panel.
 - i. Sam Martinez – 29th/Myrtle. Concern with the buffer area is that it will modify the areas that people moved to, to something different from what they bought.
 - j. Rober Owens - Ray St – would like a legend on all maps, just adds a professional touch.
 - k. Jennifer Graves – Is concerned that CPIOZ will increase density. Raises the issue that this issue may not happen in Mission Hills. Likes the neighborhood, and doesn't want to see the SFR torn down for apartments/condos. Wants to know what could be done to prevent homes from being torn down – conservation zone could help.
 - l. Don L – Wants to see Todd Gloria's office push more for saving the SFR properties.

- m. Alan Bennett – states that San Diego is the worst when it comes to planning, isn't in favor of the CPOIZ, feels it helps the developers more than the community. Doesn't feel it's fair that he moves into an area, and then could be forced to go to a grocery store further away.
- n. Ed Cronan – feels that the board should prohibit additional commercial in the grocery store areas.
- o. Rachel – discussed the difference between CPIOZ A and B.
- p. Dionne – could it be possible to have the same property in both A and B? Sounds like it would be possible but difficult.
- q. Steve – says yes, the geographic areas are needed. City needs to hear that certain areas would benefit from such a design guideline.
- r. Dang – agreed with Steve
- s. Peter – agrees that design guidelines need to be incorporated into the higher density corridors.
- t. Roger M – The topic is hard to discuss in the abstract, what are the guidelines and how wiggle-proof are they? Likes the idea in general, but this is the first step.
- u. Kevin – Repeats Roger's comment. Wants to encourage traits we like, and encourage developers to provide projects that the community likes.
- v. Sarah – restricting curb cuts made JITB more of a disaster. Needs to be an idea to consider, not a hard fast rule. Wants ideas of successful CPOIZ examples if they exist. You don't get parking credits unless you automatically go for discretionary review.
- w. Roger – building code vs community plan. Issue with parking bonuses allowing additional height credit.
- x. Rachel – agreed support on design guidelines, should be in the CP in general. CPOIZ may not go far enough.
- y. Dionne – we need the guidelines, happy to see them done by CPOZ if it gives us more control. Would like to see a list of things we can ask for, vs a list of what we'd have to give to get the development.
- z. Rick – in full agreement with everything that's been said (especially Sarah's comment). When we give perks to developers, that changes the situation and should immediately kick it to discretionary.
- aa. Cherie Dean – Ray St – What is the purpose of a community plan, and to what extent does it need to reflect the requests of the community. It's a policy document about the vision of a specific community (goals, objectives etc.). Of what use is the document to implement that? If people don't like a project because it doesn't meet the community plan, it carries more weight in rejecting a project.
- bb. Don – have been talking about the community plan, all these projects have been built up. Wants instant moratorium.
- cc. Rob – Because of the strong mayor form of government, the perspectives of planning staff changes as they take charge from the mayor. Wightman is different from the 4 areas in the proposed.

CPOZ

- iii. Tailored Zoning
- iv. Integrated into planning documents
- b. Specific Discussion Issues postponed**
 - i. 30th between Howard & Madison
 - ii. Drive Through
 - iii. Parking Issues
 - iv. Height
 - v. Density
- c. Donations received: \$147
- d. **Next Steps**
 - i. **Design guidelines, breaking out Wightman St from the 4 zones**
 - ii. **Toolbox list**

VI. Motion to Adjourn: Hill/Carlson 12-0-0

Minutes submitted by Brandon Hilpert