



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Group

DRAFT MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING

JULY 19, 2016 (TUESDAY) – 6:00-8:30 p.m.

Grace Lutheran Church Fellowship Hall

3967 Park Blvd.

DATE: 7/19/16

Call to order by Leo Wilson at 6:08

In attendance: (16 members) Cindy Thorsen, Gary Bonner, Leo Wilson, Roy Dahl, Ken Tablang, Soheil Nakhshab, Mat Wahlstrom, Bill Ellig, Bob Daniel, Maya Rosas, Jay Newington, Dana Hook, Amie Hayes, Michael Brennan, Tim Gahagan, Tom Mullaney

I. Call to Order and Introductions

II. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order

Bob Daniel moves to approve, agenda approved on voice vote

III. Public Communication – Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54954.3, as applicable to special meetings, members of the public will be provided the opportunity to make public comment regarding the special order of business on the agenda. There will be no non-agenda public comment.

IV. Special Order of Business

- 1. Uptown Community Plan Update –** The final draft of the Uptown Community Plan update, and associated draft Environment Impact Report (DEIR), have been released. The public has 60 days (until August 8, 2016) to comment on the DEIR, The July 19, 2016 meeting will primarily focus on the Draft EIR and the proposed alternatives it contains. However, comments and questions regarding the entire draft Uptown Community Plan Update and DEIR are welcome.

Public Comment heard from various community members including Ann Garwood, Nancy Moors, Deirdre Lee, Sharon Gehl, Elizabeth Robinson, Ian Epley

Motion by Mullaney / Dahl:

Resolution on Alternatives

Whereas

- 1. The proposed Uptown Community Plan Update (June 2016 Version) does not incorporate years of community input.**

2. There is insufficient mitigation (existing and proposed) to support high density and additional traffic in central Hillcrest.
3. The Density Redistribution Alternative includes much of the community input, and is compatible with the recommendations of the Uptown Planners.
4. The Density Redistribution Alternative meets the goal of locating density near major transit corridors by allowing increased densities near the Park Boulevard corridor, to be served by the existing Rapid Bus Route and the planned Mid-City trolley line.
5. The Density Redistribution Alternative has been identified as the “Environmentally Superior Alternative.”
6. It is important to provide appropriate transitions between different types of development.

Resolution

We resolve that the City adopt the Density Redistribution Alternative, and recommend that additional provisions be included in the Community Plan and zoning which will improve the transitions between different densities and heights.

Amendment by Wahlstrom / Bonner to separate resolutions

For (9) Ellig, Wahlstrom, Newington, Gahagan, Daniel, Bonner, Mullaney, Thorsen, Hayes

Against (6) Tabling, Dahl, Rosas, Nahkshab, Brennan, Hook
Abstain Chair

Motion to approve resolutions (Mullaney / Dahl)

For (11) Ellig, Wahlstrom, Newington, Tablang, Gahagan, Dahl, Daniel, Bonner, Mullaney, Thorsen, Hayes

Against (4) Rosas, Nahkshab, Brennan, Hook
Abstain Chair

Bill Ellig: supportive of density where it is appropriate, supportive of mobility options
Mat Wahlstrom: Proposes amendment to separate out parts of the motion for clarity.

Tim: Concerned about density in the proposed plan. Res

Rosas: The proposed plan has 109 DU, on park it goes up to 73 DU. In the redistributed alternative it reduces density in 9 areas including the Hillcrest core. The redistributed density focuses development has greater impacts on east Hillcrest. The alternative also increases GHG emissions over the proposed plan.

Daniel: Proposes that if some density needs to shift to the core that can happen in concert with our recommendations.

Nahkshab: Planning needs to be done holistically and not focused entirely on density. Affordable housing should be an included part of the update.

Brennan: Agrees with what Maya presented to the board and regrets that there is not an option for a village to occur in the core of Hillcrest and at Park Blvd.

Bonner: Supportive of the redistribution alternative.

Hook: Infrastructure has been neglected but we can't build for the peak hour traffic jams, that would be a waste of resources. She is supportive of the proposed Community plan as it will allow the community to grow incrementally over time.

Thorsen: Agrees with the redistribution alternative.

Hayes: Agrees with Thorsen & Brennan. Feels that the redistribution alternative is closest to what the community is after.

2. Uptown Community Plan Update– summary and recommendations from the Uptown Community Plan Update Committee.

Mullaney & Ellig: Present Mobility discussion from the community plan update committee.

Motion by Ellig / Gahagan

Resolution:

Therefor it is recommended that several of the mitigation measures proposed by the traffic consultant be added to the Mobility Element. The objective is to reduce the number of intersections and roadway segments that are projected to have “cumulative traffic related impacts.”

(12) Ellig, Wahlstrom, new tab, gah, dahl, Daniel, bonner, hook, thorsen, hayes, mullaney

(1) Brennan

(3) Rosas, Soheil, Chair

Bonner presents recreation related motions previously passed to be reaffirmed
Mullaney / Bonner

SET #1. 2/24/15

1. We support the inclusion of two Recreation Centers and an Aquatic Complex, as important amenities for Uptown.
2. We support the addition of a Neighborhood Park on Reynard Way.
3. We support the addition of Pocket Parks/Plazas at Golden Gate Drive, Laurel St., Olive Street, and West Maple Canyon.
4. We support joint-use agreements with Florence Elem. School and Grant K-8 School, for existing and new facilities.
5. We support the addition of a community park/ sports complex on Pershing Dr., if Uptown DIF money is not used. This area is currently occupied by City Operations, and not used for park purposes.

[Explanation: This project is supported because it would create a new recreation facility, and is not merely a reclassification of existing park space.]

6. We support the Normal St. Linear Park.
- 6.5. We request that Mystic Park be included in the table for planned Neighborhood Parks. And that the Reynard Way Park and Mystic Park be considered top priorities.
7. We recommend that substantial new parkland be listed in the Recreation Element, whether the location is specific or “to be determined”. We request clarification of the 66.72 acres of “Population-based park deficit at full community development”, specifically, how that deficit will be addressed in this element.

8. We reject the inclusion of canyons as meeting park requirements.

- a. Canyons are part of the Open Space system.
- b. As in the past, the city should inventory and plan Open Space areas of our community separately from the Park and Recreation areas.
- c. There is no direction in the General Plan to regard open space or canyons as parkland.
- d. The open space canyons in Uptown consist of slopes and natural vegetation. Most of the canyon land is privately owned. The canyons are accessible only by foot trails. In summary,

the open space canyons in Uptown have none of the characteristics of a park. They are suitable as passive open space, not parks.

9. We reject the counting of portions of Balboa Park as part of the park acreage requirements for Uptown.

The reasons are:

a. Balboa Park is a regional park, already used by people from the entire metro area, plus visitors. It has about 10 million visitors per year. It has none of the characteristics of a community or neighborhood park.

b. Balboa Park is very busy on summer days and during special events like marathons and parades. It's not accessible to residents as a neighborhood park at those times.

c. The Balboa Park Committee reviewed this issue in 2006, and recommended against it. (minutes dated 12/7/2006). In later years, the Balboa Park Committee stated that they will oppose any efforts to allow Uptown to program or control portions of Balboa Park.

d. The Uptown Planners has consistently opposed any proposals to use DIF funds to improve Balboa Park, which is a regional asset.

11. Regarding park access to residents:

a. We support the addition of the goal which was stated in the current Community Plan: To locate new park sites so that all residents have access to a park within one-half mile of their homes.

b. We support in concept the addition of a provisions in the Community Plan and zoning, which are equivalent to Section 151.0253 in the Central Urbanized Planned District. This includes special provisions for "Facility Deficient Neighborhoods". According to Planning Dept staff, this was originally intended to be adopted in Uptown, but was overlooked.

SET #2. 11/19/15

Motion 1

Regarding a Survey of Potential Park Sites:

The General Plan states that the City's primary goal is to obtain land for park and recreational facilities.

Since Uptown needs additional parkland to mitigate the impacts of growth, it is desirable to establish a baseline for potential parkland before development proceeds under the updated plan.

Prior to the adoption of the Uptown Community Plan, a Survey of Potential Park Sites will be completed, and reviewed at a public hearing.

This survey will include the following:

1. Paper streets.
2. Undeveloped lots, whether public or privately owned.
3. Publicly owned land which has been identified as surplus.
4. Publicly owned land with buildings which are unused, or have been

determined to be obsolete. Examples are the DMV site, and the San Diego Unified School District site on Normal Street.

5. Remnant lots.

This survey is not intended to identify all sites with future potential as park sites. It is recognized that currently developed land may become available in the future to satisfy park needs. This includes:

1. Public land currently in use.
2. Private land, to be obtained by the city through bequest, purchase, exchange, and Transfer of Development Rights.

Reference above to "parks" is assumed to include potential use as plazas.

Motion 2:

There should be a moratorium of the sale of any City owned lands in Uptown until the stipulations of the "motion regarding a survey of potential park sites" has been completed.

Motion 3:

Uptown Planners supports the City in its response to public input to rescind its plans for recreation centers within Balboa Park.

SET #3. 5/3/16.

1. In the interest of transparency, Uptown Planners moves that the Revised Recreation Element, "Existing and Future Population" should be modified. The Element should state that as of 2014 the population was 36,750. At the minimum General Plan standard of 2.8 acres per 1000 residents for population-based parks, the current park requirement is 103 acres. Uptown's current park space is 18 acres, resulting in a current deficit of 85 acres.

2. Uptown Planners, noting that the Recreation Element acknowledges a deficit of 100 acres of parkland, moves to have Parks and Recreation establish and include in the Recreation Element the goal of reducing that deficit by 2.5% per year for the 20-year period ending 2037 and reporting to Uptown Planners by August 31, 2016 both the associated financing plan and the implementation schedule to achieve the 2.5% per year for 20-years goal.

3. The Community Plan will contain an implementation provision as follows:

The Park & Recreation Department will provide an annual report describing the status of park and recreation facilities in the Uptown community.

The report will include an inventory of existing facilities, improvements made, projects in work, and related financial information.

4. A provision should be added to the section regarding "privately-owned, public-used parks":

An implementation mechanism will be created to ensure ongoing public access to private spaces which have been committed for public use.

5. A provision should be added as follows:

It is intended that Development Impact Fees which go into the Uptown Community fund will be spent on projects within the community boundaries (that is, within Uptown, and not in Balboa Park).

6. A provision should be added as follows:

It is intended that DIF funds be spent on project categories in rough proportion to the manner in which the DIF's were assessed in the Impact Fee Study. As an example, if 80% of the DIF revenues were based on planned Park & Recreation projects, then approximately 80% of the DIF revenues should be spent on Park & Recreation projects.

7. Previous board motions were reaffirmed, that DIF funds shall be used in the neighborhood in which they were generated.

Discussion:

Gahagan supportive of motion but is ok with park equivalencies using canyons

Thorsen: We don't want the equivalencies

Motion Passes:

For (9) Wahlstrom, Newington, Tablang, Gahagan, Dahl, Bonner, Thorsen, Hayes, Mullaney

Against (0)

Abstain (7) Ellig, Rosas, Nahkshab, Daniel, Brennan, Hook, Chair

DMV site aquatics center motion Wahlstrom / Bonner

(10) Ellig, Wahlstrom, Newington, Tablang, Dahl, Daniel, Nahkshab, Bonner, Thorsen, Hayes

(3) Ga, Rosas, Hook

(2) Brennan, Chair

Normal Street Linear Park

Tom / Wahlstrom

14 / 0 / 1