



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE (NPPC)

Draft Meeting Minutes

June 16, 2020; 6:30 pm

Meeting held virtually Via Zoom Platform

www.northparkplanning.org
info@northparkplanning.org

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

To receive NPPC Agendas & Announcements sign up at:

https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning/app_100265896690345

I. Parliamentary Items

- Virtual Meeting Platform Notice.** After our May 19, 2020 meeting the board received many questions and comment on the Q&A and chat functions. The board regrets that some of the questions that were asked in the Q&A were not answered, as this was a limit of our human ability to both effectively participate in the meeting while also managing it. Lastly, there was some confusion about the chat being recorded. The Q&A and the chat is **not** public comment and is therefore not recorded. Given these misunderstands and in order to better mimic our in-person meeting and best practices in other community planning groups the board will be disabling chat and Q&A features moving forward as a way to streamline the process and make it possible to manage our meetings effectively. Thus, if a comment would like to be made for the record it must be done during public comment as normal.

2. Call to Order, Roll Call and Attendance Report

Member	Steve Billings	Steve Doster	Daniel Gebreselassie	Arash Kahvazadeh	Marc Gould	Sarah McAlear	Aria Pounaki	Jen Spencer	Melissa Stayner	Matt Stucky	Tim Taylor	Marissa Tucker	Eduardo Velasquez	René Vidales	Randy Wilde
Attendance		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Late															
Absences	2	3	1	2	6	2	1		3	1	2		3		1

- Minutes:** Approval of the May 19, 2020 Minutes.
 Amend comments on public comment on page 5 to clarify that Pat Sexton was in opposition.
MOTION: To approve May 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes with edits proposed by Pat Sexton, Wilde/ Kahvazadeh 12-0-1 (Velasquez abstaining due to absence)
- Treasurer's Report:** Sarah McAlear/Randy Wilde. Account balance is \$869.57. Request for Reimbursement for purchase of Zoom Meetings account for one year (\$149.90)
MOTION: To approve reimbursement for \$149.90. McAlear/Stayner 13-0-0

II. Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Elizabeth Ackermann: There are 4 houses on Polk Ave that someone is trying to buy from her and her neighbors. She is looking for help or resources.
- Eugene Polley: What are the options for holding elections since other offices throughout the country have been able to hold elections. A: Council Policy as recently amended for CPG operations during the COVID pandemic doesn't allow NPPC to hold an election.

3. Pat Sexton: Clarifying question on what the extent on North Park Main Street's open streets proposal. A: This is out of the committee's purview and NPPC hasn't received any more information since the May meeting. Referred to contact North Park Main Street.

III. Announcements & Event Notices

1. **North Park Thursday Market (Farmers Market).** Every Thursday 3pm-7:30pm year-round. More info at: <https://northparkmainstreet.com/events/farmers-market/>

IV. Elected Official & Planner Reports:

1. **Robert (Bobby) Case, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congress Dist. 53,** 619-208-5353, robert.case@mail.house.gov. Not present.
2. **Mathew Gordon, Hon. Todd Gloria, State Assembly Dist. 78,** 619-645-3090, Mathew.Gordon@asm.ca.gov. Not present.
3. **Chevelle Newell-Tate, Hon. Toni Atkins, State Senate Dist. 39,** 619-645-3133, Chevelle.Tate@sen.ca.gov. Not present.
4. **Brett Weise, Hon. Chris Ward, City Council Dist. 3,** 619-236-6633 BWeise@sandiego.gov. Not present.
5. **Bernie Turgeon, Planning Department,** 619-533-6575, BTurgeon@sandiego.gov. Not present.

V. Action Items

1. **Mississippi and El Cajon Boulevard Easement Vacation 651149.** A sewer easement was built in the 1920s across lot lines in order for a sewer lateral to be connected to an interior lot. Such easement is no longer needed or applicable given the common ownership and new development plans. The Public Service Easement Vacation (Process 2) action is to vacate the sewer easement and portion of SDG&E easement on the southern side of lots 1, 2, & 3 at the southwest corner of El Cajon Blvd. and Mississippi St. The 0.06-acre site is in the CC-39 Zone of the North Park Community Plan area, Council District 3. The recommendation requested from the board is on the sewer vacation and not on the development project. The development project is called North Park Affordable, a proposed ministerial project with 61 Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units plus ground floor retail. Rob Morgan and David Allen, Trestle Build rob@trestlebuild.com, david@trestlebuild.com

Rob Morgan made a presentation on both the sewer easement vacation and the proposed project. There will be a 6-story building that provides fully affordable housing with a number of room configurations, amenities, and ground floor retail facing El Cajon Blvd. The sewer easement is facing the current alley and will no longer be needed after development.

Public Comment:

- Pat Sexton: **Q:** How much parking? **A:** 3 Parking stalls in the alley
- Eugene Polley: **Q:** What mitigation studies have you done on parking? **A:** This is a by-right development following city allowances for Transit Priority Area (TPA) parking regulations. In order to deliver the maximum housing units possible, this is what was chosen for the project.
- Michael Bagnas: **Q:** Where are people going to park in the commercial space? **A:** The three stalls will likely be reserved for the commercial use, in addition to street parking.
- Elizabeth Ackermann: **Q:** What regulations are there to protect people like her experiencing predatory practices from developers? Specifically around ensuring that affordable housing is actually made available to those in the community who need it. **A:** Oversight provided by the San Diego Housing Commission regarding affordable housing regulations.
- Steven Oechel: **Q** to board members: what options are available to residents who disagree with the zoning that allowed this to happen? **A:** A change to the municipal code.
- Kate Callen: **Q:** How much are the apartments going for? **A:** approximately \$1000-\$1500 **Q:** How do you choose residents? **A:** Property Manager reviews requests, more or less a lottery style system. **Q:** How do we know this product won't change to market rate? **A:** This is a

deed-restricted project at this point. **Comment:** Developer's website doesn't reflect current project scope.

- Bob LaRose: **Q:** Do the affordable housing regulations affect all the units? **A:** all units except 1 are deed-restricted affordable housing.
- An Bui: **Q:** How big are the units, and what is the target audience? **A:** around 450-900sqft depending on the product type. Any qualified applicant is the demographic, there are restrictions due to fair housing regulations on targeting.
- Tony Turner-Mercado: **Q:** Are there any incentives to get transit users preferentially for these units? **A:** Due to fair housing laws, there is no way to qualify applicants based on their job location or transit use. From the developer's experience in downtown, transit users self-select for these types of units because of the lack of parking. In addition, the profile of most applicants is that of non-car owners.

Board Comment:

- Doster: Supportive of the project.
- Gebreselassie: Supportive, but asked if the neighbors have been notified. **A:** Yes, there is an on-site posting with notices per the City's requirements.
- Kahvazadeh: **Q:** How did this project qualify for the minimal parking? **A:** The City has a map that dictates the requirements for parking regulations, in addition some amenities had to be provided. **Q:** Do you have to provide any transportation amenities? **A:** Bike parking provided. **Q:** What verification is required to prove qualification for affordable housing? **A:** There is a verification process with restrictions on income and apartment size, etc.
- McAlear: The Sewer easement is a "no-brainer", agrees that there is a self-selection that occurs with housing with no parking.
- Pounaki: Supports the sewer easement and supportive regardless of the parking scenario.
- Spencer: No issues with the sewer easement, request that landscaping points get added to the project, keep it green!
- Stayner: **Q:** What is the Area Median Income (AMI) range? **A:** mostly at 50% AMI, and a small part are at 80% AMI
- Stucky: **Q:** Would there be a way to build that many units if each had their own parking spot? **A:** No, not without significantly more subsidy.
- Taylor: Repeated that the board is only voting on a sewer easement. Reiterated support for affordable housing in North Park.
- Tucker: Supportive of the easement and design
- Velasquez: **Q:** When will it be built? **A:** middle of 2022 completion.
- Wilde: Thanked Rob and David, supportive.
- Vidales: Congratulated Rob and David for bringing a project to North Park that complies with so many of the policies in the Community Plan.

After further discussion, the following motion was made.

MOTION: To approve the public sewer easement vacation for Project 651149 as presented. McAlear/Stayner 13-0-0

2. **Complete Communities: Play Everywhere: Parks Master Plan and General Plan Recreation Element Amendment.** The Parks Master Plan is a plan for an interconnected Citywide parks system with opportunities for everyone to get outside and play while fostering social interactions, cultural, activities, and exercise, as well as providing urban respite, enjoyable transportation options, and an increased tree canopy cover. A key component of the Parks Master Plan is equity and access-based goals that prioritize areas with park standard and park service gaps. The proposed amendment to the General Plan Recreation Element includes amendments to reflect the new policies in the Parks Master Plan. The draft Parks Master Plan and General Plan Recreation Element Amendment documents are available at:

Jen Spencer and Tim Taylor made a presentation on the Parks Master Plan and General Plan Recreation Element Amendment.

Public Comment:

- Tony Turner-Mercado: **Q:** What are DIF funds, and how does this relate to parks? **A:** Development Impact Fees are fees that developers pay when they have a new project in the City. There is a plan to change how to use those fees, currently, these fees stay in the community the development happens in. But the problem is that neighborhoods without new development are starved of funding. The change would allow for allocation of funding to be more equitable.
- Elizabeth Ackermann: **Q:** Is there a neighborhood association that would allow freer discussion? **A:** The North Park Community Association (other resources on the agenda)

Board Comment:

- Wilde: Expressed support for changes for greater access and equity. Agrees with the consensus gained by Tim and Jen on recommendations the board should make.
- Velazquez: **Procedural question:** the public comment period appears to be closed; how can we weigh in now? **A:** Planning Commission and City Council will consider our comments even though we missed the EIR public comment period.
- Tucker: Not much more to add
- Taylor: Concerned that the citizen survey was self-selecting for the answers they wanted, forcing folks to choose between upgrades or new park land
- Stucky: Community plan specifically calls for land acquisition, concerns over private parks filling in the gaps (Date Street in Little Italy as an example). Expressed his desire to have park staff present to help answer questions.
- Pounaki: Supportive of strategic land acquisition/street vacations to create park space, however deficit of urban areas is systemic and NPPC should not allow our stature to be diminished below the amenitization level that are common in much less populated suburban areas; Balboa Park could be developed better adjacent to North Park to better serve nearby residents.
- Stayner: No comments
- Kahvazadeh: Feels that the vision is inspiring but vague and concerned that we would be affected negatively. Desire to have City staff to present and answer questions.
- Gebreselassie: North Park is about to receive more development but will lose out on the associated revenue this would normally mean. Expressed a desire for our community to hold some percentage of our DIF funds to address the impacts from new development. **Q:** What documentation is there? **A:** Parks Master Plan, Summary of Surveys, Work Plans, Existing Conditions Report, etc. (links available in the agenda).
- Doster: Concerned that so much time gets spent on planning for parks and changes that there is rarely funds for timely construction.
- Spencer: The goal of the City is to get every park to a score of 12. Nervous that our parks would score so high in the new scoring system that they would fall in priority. Step in the right direction since this is the first update since the 50s.
- Vidales: Echoes that scoring system is a concern. **Q:** Is equivalency still a part of the equation? **A:** Certainly, in terms of joint use. Our community plan still calls for a neighborhood center to be built in Balboa Park.

After further discussion, the following motion was made.

MOTION: Motion to approve the creation of a letter with recommendations and concerns to the City as outlined and discussed in today's meeting. McAlear/Spencer 9-4-0 (Tucker, Velazquez, Stucky, Pounaki voting no)

Tim, Jen, and Aria will take the lead to generate the letter.

3. **Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices.** Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices proposes amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) to provide incentives to increase housing production and expand the mobility network around transit hubs and existing development. The initiative removes regulatory barriers to housing to all income levels, especially low, very low, and moderate-income households, while investing in neighborhood and mobility amenities, such as recreational opportunities, street trees, linear parks, bicycle facilities, urban plazas, and promenades. These types of investments increase the quality of neighborhoods where new housing is proposed by creating more walkable, bikeable and enjoyable spaces, which in turn helps the City meet its Climate Action Plan goals. Prioritizing these investments in areas where the investments are needed most are central to the intent behind the Complete Communities initiative.

The Housing Solutions draft documents are available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/completenessolutions/housingsolutions>

The Mobility Choices documents are available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/mobility/mobilitychoices>

Due to time constraints, presentations by board member Aria Pounaki on Housing Solutions and by board members Steve Doster and Arash Kahvazadeh on Mobility Choices were not made.

Public Comment:

- An Bui: This is an important issue for our neighborhood to hear about because of neighborhood character concerns.
- Tony Turner-Mercado: Representing Auntie Helen's Thrift Store, has real concerns about priorities that further advantages of the able bodied at the expense of the differently abled.

(Velazquez left the meeting)

After further discussion, the following motion was made.

MOTION: To ask for City staff to present the Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices at the next meeting of the NPPC. Pounaki/Kahvazadeh 8-4-0 (Tucker, Pounaki, Stucky, and Taylor voting no)

4. **2019-2020 NPPC Annual Report.** Summary consisting of administrative issues, awards, historic districts, letters of support and special projects, summary of project review, and activities of associated community organizations along with approved meeting minutes from April 16, 2019 to February 18, 2020. The annual report is to be submitted to the City after approval from NPPC.

MOTION: To accept 2019/2020 NPPC Annual Report. Taylor/Stucky 12-0-0

VI. Information Item

1. **NPPC Transition Plan.** Overview of Meeting Procedures and discussion of transition to new Chair.

Chair Vidales gave an announcement about phasing out from the board, as the July meeting will probably be his last with NPPC. He gave an overview of the meeting procedures in order to have them ready for the next Chair and for the new board after the next general election.

The meeting procedures are divided in the following sections:

- Meeting Location, number of meetings and board distribution
- Tasks to be done
- NPPC Deadlines every year
- Additional logistics in Sanctuary

- Responsibilities for Officers, Subcommittee Chairs, Liaisons to other groups, and all board members
- NPPC Subcommittee Meeting Procedures

Conversation about how to handle the transition of power. Two board members volunteered to chair meetings up until the election takes place and a new board gets seated. A decision was made to add this topic as an action item to the next month's meeting agenda.

- VII. **NPPC Reports.** No Reports were given due to time constraints
- VIII. **Future NPPC Meeting Date:** Next meeting is Tuesday, July 21, 2020
- IX. **Adjournment.** Meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.