

# Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group



P.O. Box 16391, San Diego, CA 92176

www.ktpg.org

## Regular Meeting Minutes - **DRAFT**

2010-06-09

### CONTENTS

- Parliamentary Items .....2
- Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions .....2
- Modifications to and Adoption of Agenda (Additions / Deletions to Agenda).....2
- Approval of Minutes – Minutes from prior meeting(s) .....2
- Treasurer’s Report – Report from Prior Month.....3
- Community Forum / Non-Agenda Public Comment.....3
- Subcommittee Reports.....10
- Transportation and Safety – Bob Coffin .....11
- Action item: ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- Information Item .....11
- Project Review – Tom Adam.....13
- Action item: ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- Information Item ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- Membership and Communications – John M. Garrison .....10
- Action item: .....11



Information Item .....11

KMAD – Tom Hebrank .....11

Action item: ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Information Item ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

KTPG Liaison Committee Reports .....13

Agenda for the next KTPG Meeting .....13

Adjournment .....13

**PARLIAMENTARY ITEMS**

**CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS**

A regular meeting of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group (KTPG) was called to order by KTPG Chair Tom Hebrank on June 9, 2010 at 6:35pm in the Kensington Community Church located at 4773 Marlborough Ave., San Diego, CA 92116. The minutes were recorded by KTPG Secretary John M. Garrison.

**Members present at the start of the meeting:** Bob Coffin, Daniele Laman, David Moty, Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, Gail Greer, Guy Hanford, John M. Garrison, Kevin Kelly, Pam Hubbell, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Tom Adam, Tom Hebrank.

8:20 – Tom Adam arrived.

**Members absent:** Tom Adam [**Check bylaws on whether Tom Adam attended enough of the meeting to be present**]. (The rule you are thinking of was not passed by the board – David)

**Also present:** Dion Akers (from Council Member Todd Gloria’s office) and numerous members of the public

**MODIFICATIONS TO AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA (ADDITIONS / DELETIONS TO AGENDA)**

A motion to approve the agenda with no changes was made by David Moty and seconded by Fred Lindahl. The motion was approved unanimously 14-0-0.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING(S)**

There were three months of minutes ready to be considered for approval.

Moty – moved to approve the March minutes; Tom Hoyt seconded. Approved unanimously 14-0-0.



Moty – moved to approve the April minutes; Fred seconded. John abstained. Passed 13-0-1

Moty – moved to approve the May minutes; Tom Hoyt seconded. Passed unanimously, 14-0-0.

## TREASURER'S REPORT – REPORT FROM PRIOR MONTH

**Starting Balance:** May - \$138.97

**Donations:** \$15

**Expenditures:** \$48 – Check #3095 to Postmaster for 6 months P.O. box rental

**Ending Balance:** \$105.97

## COMMUNITY FORUM / NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

6:40pm - Dion Akers from Council Member Todd Gloria's office mentioned several items, including:

- Neighborhood watch
- Propositions that passed yesterday's election
- Discussions on what is happening with Price Charities and the Pearson Ford site

Roger Utt mentioned:

City Attorney issued a memo opining on the duties of a planning group. He believes the KTPG should examine the things they are considering and whether they are consistent with that opinion.

Our board chairman appointed a liaison to the historic resources department, and we have never heard a report on what she has been doing.

Repaving on Kensington drive – the machine doing the smoothing is small, and that is resulting in a bumpy strip.

The Kensington sign is on the agenda as an action item, but it did not go through the Project Review subcommittee. This is the first time I have seen that.

Tom Hebrank said we did have an update on the community liaison to the historic resources department. We said we would have it approximately quarterly. We are probably do for one.

Roger – that update only said how many communications there had been, not what was in them.

Sherry Hopwood – is it possible that the communications did not all pertain to this community?

Roger – She said that all these did relate to our community.

David Moty – Asked a question of the representative from Price Charities about the Pearson Ford site. The rumor is that that Price Charities has bought up the remainder of the eastern block, which was only partially owned by Pearson Ford previously.



## NON-SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS

### KENSINGTON SIGN

#### ACTION ITEM: THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS ASKED US TO ISSUE A LETTER OF SUPPORT

Tom Hebrank – I will speak to Roger Utt’s question about the sign. I was approached on May 25<sup>th</sup>, by the city to provide a letter of support or approval by the KTPG.

Harold – I provided to Harold a 29 page packet on the sign. The original sign was done on one page. I understood about 4 pages of the 29 pages, because most if it is technical.

We are replicating the design exactly.

The sign will be 8 feet to the west, which will put it precisely in the middle of the street. The reason for that is that removing the cement cores would hinder traffic for a period of several days, and might endanger building foundations.

Question from community – when is the date for the sign?.

Harold – My goal is to hang it on Thanksgiving because that is the date the original sign was hung.

Celia Conover – is it supported by cables or rods?

Harold – They are cables

Celia – the plans say to use color PMS#348 and I would like to know how you arrived at that color. The original document specified dark green, and that PMS#348 looks bright to me, even accounting for fading.

Harold – Yes, I think that is something that I need to make everyone aware of.

Celia – the neon – your text refers to \_\_\_\_\_, but the original neon color was specified as Rose.

Someone with Harold said that is the exact match.

Celia – your new design specifies access panels on the front rather than the top. That is not an exact replica.

Harold – The access panels on the front are to facilitate easier access.

Roger Utt – The issue related to the historicity of the sign is only for the sign and its suspended nature, not for the pole. Now we are going to get a pole that looks like the last one. Can’t we get a different type of pole? The guidance we got from HRB was to make them as close to the original as possible.

John M. Garrison -

Kevin Kelly – this question is for Tom. With respect to the letter, I’m not sure to what purpose our letter will be put. What in the process is compelling the letter.



Tom Hebrank – I really see it as a city CYA.

Kevin – my objections to that are both philosophical and factual. I want to get the sign re-hung. With regard to the philosophical point, our role so far has been to facilitate our purpose. Our role has not been to certify the factual matters. And that leads me to the factual matter. I believe the community is somewhat split on the issue. I don't think we should sign off saying that the community is 100% behind the sign and then be the group that everyone points to about why we have this design.

Roger Utt – but you haven't reviewed the plans. You haven't done what the letter says you have done.

Kevin – that is exactly to my point. We have not reviewed this. I don't feel comfortable passing off on a lie, even if it is a watered-down statement.

Gail Greer – could we perhaps include a statement about the community's diverse opinions, but overall the community wants to move forward. I think the community wants a sign, which one it is is a bit of a question. I believe which one it is has been removed from the community.

Pam Hubbell – just having followed the process from 2 years ago, my preference would be to see a letter coming out of this group saying that a satisfactory compromise has been reached. I think the proof of that is that not many people asked for their money back. It can go forward to other more qualified bodies to talk to specific facts.

Sherry Hopwood – we are talking about moving the signs 8 feet to the west.

Harold – those locations are marked on the pavement. It would be right by the restaurant.

Sean Harrison – I think it actually improves the location aesthetically.

Sherry – has any coordination been done with the Burger Lounge?

Harold – No there has not.

Gail – we did approve a condition on Burger Lounge that they would modify their railing.

Sherry – exactly, that is why I think they should be coordinating now.

Sean Harrison – I guess my only statement would be, trying to be the least hyperbolic as possible. The group was offered to do several months ago to do exactly the same thing, to take a stance on the sign. This reminds me of the fact that the Secretary of the Interior is the ultimate authority on this. This reminds me of the oil spill in the gulf. We had the opportunity to go ahead and support the design review previously.

Danielle – once the construction gets started, how long would it take?

Harold – I will defer to Daryl to answer that.

Danielle – I will support a letter more in the vein of what Pam suggested, steering clear of the facts.

Dion – I am humbly pleased that the letter from Council Member Gloria's letter is being used as a template, but you are no means bound to support that.



Kevin – One more word with respect to my position on the sign, I want it to go forward. My question is really simple. What is the effect of our letter on the process; its approval or its declination? Will it speed things up will it slow things down, etc.

Tom Hebrank – I think that others see us a representative body. They want to know that the representative body of the community supports it or not.

Tom Hebrank – Motion – We support the compromise design of the Kensington sign, and urge you to expedite the approval process.

Bob Coffin – seconded

John Garrison –

Gail Greer – is there a representative from the Development Services Office. [There was not.]

Dion – To declare the process as I understand it, the mayor’s staff has asked for the KTPG and the Council Office to put out a letter on this before it goes to city staff.

Gail – I have a suggestion that we remove the word “design” from the letter.

Sherry – I think we should say “We are fully supporting building a sign, pending approval by HRB and the Planning Office review and approval”.

Danielle – Maybe something really general – like we support the idea of a compromise.

Dion – Development Services Office and different offices have different things that they look at.

Roger – I have to tell you. I know the process. I do this every day. You submit the plans to development services, it goes though all the departments, including HRB if necessary. Only then does it go to the planning group for approval.

Danielle – maybe we can say that we approve it pending the approvals coming back to KTPG for final approval

Kevin – If this letter as recommended by Danielle goes forward, then it would come back to us, right?

Roger – Normally this would be the case.

Tom Hebrank – I am going to defer to Fred Lindahl

Fred – I don’t know if it is a process 1, 2, 3, or 4, but I believe it would have to come to us because it requires a permit.

John Garrison – It did not have to come to us before when they got a permit to take it down.

Roger – Normally it would have to come to us, but if there is a political push by the mayor and it is a strong mayor form of government now, so who knows.

Celia – the argument for moving it from the old location to a new locations is partly about not knowing what they will find when they pull the old poles out, but the new location is [\(I think something is missing\)](#)



We support the compromise design of the Kensington sign, and encourage you to expedite the approval process. We further understand that the HRB will conduct a review and will go to HRB for review and then return it to KTPG for review and approval.

Project Manager – Charles \_\_\_\_

Pam – I think we have watered down the substance of the letter a lot. I think that first part that you said would water it down completely.

John Garrison – Is it true that the only vote that included this design lost narrowly?

Tom Hebrank – Yes.

John Garrison – So I am not sure I understand why we would say we understand that the community does support this.

Harold – I would like to speak to that. This design lost narrowly by 12 votes. When that happened we went back to the community and told them we want to move this design.

Frank Doft – seconded John’s motion. (I’m reading this, when was your motion made? Did you offer an amendment to the previous motion that was on the table?)

John Garrison - We support getting the getting the Kensington sign re-hung in the community, and urge you to expedite the approval process, provided that the appropriate city offices approve the design and return it to KTPG for review and approval.

Frank – seconds.

Motion fails 4-10

Approved – Sherry Hopwood, David Moty, Frank Doft, John Garrison

In favor – all but John

opposed – John

(The above series of votes is not clear to me)

The amendment to the motion failed, so the original motion was put to a vote:

The original motion was, “We support the compromise design of the Kensington sign, and encourage you to expedite the approval process. We further understand that the HRB will conduct a review and will go to HRB for review and then return it to KTPG for review and approval.”

Motion passes 13-1-0, with John M. Garrison voting against.

## KENSINGTON SIGN

---

### ACTION ITEM: CONSIDER THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE KMAD SUBCOMMITTEE



7:50: Tom Hebrank – If the KTPG supports this motion. 30% of the people have to sign a petition to call for a vote. Then 50%+1 of the community would need to vote to approve it.

Gail Greer – I have a question. Aside from the assessment, the KMAD has to pay the city back for the cost of the election. One question is how much would that be approximately and second, how much would that be per resident.

David Moty – I believe I did that math at one point. I think it was about \$25/ household, and that it would just come out of the first year's assessment.

Danielle – can we make it say “current and future” parks?

Tom Hebrank – this is not a final document.

Maggie – Would like to clarify the composition of KMAD. Tom originally asked all the community groups to donate a rep, and almost all of them did. Also, there are 15 members here today that have a vote on deciding whether to continue with the process or not. The next step would be to get 30% of the people to agree to continue the process. I hope we continue the process until we get to the point that the entire community can take a vote. For that reason I would like it to go forward. If it gets to the point that a vote is taken by the community I do plan to support it.

Ralph Riebli – Who was the “no” vote from the KMAD subcommittee?

Tom Hebrank – David Moty was the “no” vote. I will let him explain his reasoning.

David Moty – I voted no because I felt MAD supporters were going to rely on volunteers that hadn't yet volunteered, and that people would not support a MAD until the rot in the community became palpable. I don't think the community is ready to support this.

Roger Utt – one item on the list is stone columns, can we call them cobblestone columns? I've heard nothing about enhanced pedestrian access or bicycle paths. Can we put something on either of those into the list?

Tom Hebrank – this is not a final document.

Jonathan Tibbits – when Tom asked me to join the KMAD subcommittee. I was uncommitted at that time. Since that time, I have walked the streets. I have seen the palm fronds lining the streets. I have tripped over the sidewalks breaking up. I have seen the lights that are not working. I have seen today's headline that says the city debt is at \$7billion dollars. I conclude that if we wait for the city government to solve this problem that will be pie in the sky and it won't happen. My only concern is that \$120 / year may not be enough. This may be like an HOA, where the KMAD builds it and the owners may have to maintain some of it. I commend Fred Lindahl and David Moty and all the people in Talmadge who have a well-run MAD.

Danielle – question for Dion – when Undergrounding began, we were picked first because we had a MAD.

Dion – I cannot refute or validate that.





Danielle – OK, that is my understanding. My question is whether the Kensington undergrounding is set in stone, or could it be modified to take advantage of tying in with the KMAD, so that lights could be repaired, etc, on the back of the undergrounding.

Dion – It is a question loaded with a lot of parameters and a lot of things would need to go right, but yes it would be possible. If a MAD were being established, we would work to change the annual undergrounding schedule. But again it is a very, very loaded question.

Sean Harrison – 2 questions – does the KMAD have any influences on any design guidelines going forward.

Tom Hebrank – No

Sean – are the priorities set in stone, or can they be adjusted through time.

Tom Hebrank – the KMAD board could be juggling priorities through time, if they are established.

Sean – I love the idea of KMAD.

Sherry – Jonathan mentioned something, and I got a shiver. There is a reason I pay a lot for a mortgage on a home is because I don't want to be in an HOA. Is there a possibility the KMAD could tell me anything about how I keep my home?

Tom Hebrank – No.

Sherry – I think the

John – Several questions for Tom Hebrank or whoever he may direct them to:

1. It is my understanding the city automatically votes in favor of a MAD, so that the vote does not have to be 50%+1, it has to be 50%+1-whatever-the-city-parcel-vote-is. How much is that amount for the city parcels?
  - a. Tom: Yes, that is true. I don't have a figure for that, but the amount is small.
2. I see that Undergrounding did not make the list. Was there discussion about using the KMAD to underground utility boxes so that they are truly underground?
  - a. Tom: No there was not.
3. Was there discussion about alternatives, such as corporate sponsorships, private donations, etc.
  - a. Tom: At the very last meeting someone did mention that, but we are talking about \$200,000 / year and I don't think we would reach that.
4. Can you please clarify the inclusion of the Kensington neon sign? Is it proposed that the sign be transferred to the KTCA or that the money would go towards maintaining a structure owned by a private group?



- a. Tom: there is no discussion about transferring the sign from KTCA to KMAD. We are checking with the city to confirm or refute whether we would be able to pay for maintenance, insurance, etc, on something owned by someone else.

John – unless I hear something as we continue down the line that causes me to change my mind, I intend to vote “no”, and I would like to explain why:

Bob – I am going to pick up on the question about the tie-in from the undergrounding. I believe that is one of the big benefits. I am concerned our neighborhood is deteriorating.

David Moty – I am hearing from some people that they are starting to notice things that need improving in the neighborhood, so I am not going to vote against this here, even though I did vote against it before.

Fred – I agree with Danielle, I would not say playground at library, I would say playground in parks. You also mention the pillars within the business district, but I didn’t hear you mention the pillars outside the business district.

Tom Hebrank – this is not a final document. I encourage anyone who has suggestions to bring them.

Guy Hanford – A question I also had since the question came up about donations is could those be received by the KMAD.

Tom Hebrank – Yes, absolutely.

8:20 – Tom Adam arrived.

Kevin Kelly – I agree with Maggie. I want to see the entire community vote on the matter.

Gail Greer – As I was thinking about this, when Talmadge did this, I know some community members who were very cash strapped and not able to pay, and we had to raise money to help them. 10 years ago for most of us things were better, our houses were appreciating, and we weren’t in such danger of losing our jobs. The reality is some people in Kensington can’t afford this, and I don’t want to be in the action that causes them to be in danger of losing their house. I also didn’t hear enough specifics about cost, and I didn’t hear enough about alternatives. The San Diego foundation was created for the enhancement of their communities. It is a voluntary process. I know that some people are feeling that people will not donate, but I’m not sure forcing them to pay is the right thing. I believe we need to look at other options.

The motion passes 13-2-0, with John and Gail voted against.

David Moty – moved to extend by 45 minutes, seconded by Danielle. Approved 14-1-0 with Frank Doft opposed.

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

### MEMBERSHIP AND COMMUNICATIONS – JOHN M. GARRISON



---

## ACTION ITEM: LETTER IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY GARDENS

John M. Garrison explained that the 1-in-10 Community Garden coalition was trying to get the process of creating community gardens to be more streamlined.

Kristen \_\_\_\_ from the 1-in-10 Coalition explained that the current process can cost \$45,000, which is something that a group of neighbors is not likely to be able to fund.

John M. Garrison read the motion as passed by the subcommittee. It is attached here as Exhibit A.

Danielle Laman asked that the salutation be changed to “Ladies and Gentlemen” and John agreed to that as a friendly amendment.

Fred Lindahl said that the letter currently says “Support changing the approval process for a community garden from a Process Two to a Process One. “ He suggested changing it to “Support changing the approval process for community gardens from a Process Two to a Process One. “ John agreed to that as a friendly amendment.

Roger Utt asked John to clarify about the Process One vs Process Two. John thanked Roger for the reminder. John explained that the Process One would not require a proposed community garden to come before the local community planning group. John said that the subcommittee did discuss this, but no one present either on the subcommittee or the public could think of any strong objections people would have. Therefore, they felt that there was no reason for community gardens to have to be heard by local planning groups.

Tom Hebrank called for a vote. The motion passed 11-4-0, with Hebrank, Moty, Lindahl, Hanford opposed. The final letter as approved is attached here as Exhibit B.

## TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY – BOB COFFIN

---

### INFORMATION ITEM: UNDERGROUNDING

Bob Coffin introduced Bill Bamberger and Terry Frey, who made a presentation by Bill Bamberger who is in favor of undergrounding.

The presentation mentioned several benefits they presenters believe would come from undergrounding:

- Power lines are a fire hazard.
- New telephone and cable lines would replace old, decaying ones.
- New electrical service to street lamps.
- Wires and Poles are ugly.
- They have a website at [kensingtonunderground.com](http://kensingtonunderground.com)
- We would love for it to all be underground, but what we want more is for it to be done. We don't want undergrounding stopped and we don't want it delayed.



- We heard from a lot of residents in Talmadge who do think it is an improvement.

9:14: David Moty made a motion to extend the meeting 15 minutes, Danielle Laman seconded the motion. It passed 13-2 with John Garrison and Frank Doft voting against.

Ralph Riebli – my comment is that we don't want to stop the undergrounding. I think that is a big misconception. We want it done right. I don't think we should just plow ahead with what they did in Talmadge. You can say maybe there will only be one box per 10 houses, although that is not our information. But even if that is true, it is a big deal in front of your house.

Bob Coffin – I think it is the goal of our community to get it done right. We don't want it to happen the way it happened in Talmadge.

Don Taylor – Until about 4 weeks ago, I was completely in favor of undergrounding because I thought it was going to be all underground. Then I heard that this wouldn't be the case. I went and looked at Talmadge and was shocked at how it looks like and how bad that looks. I went down to Pallsades, where it is all underground, and how beautiful that looks. We spend a lot of time on getting the Kensington sign right, and even getting the color of concrete sidewalk repairs right. And I applaud that. I think we need to get this right as well.

Celia – I think it is important to have the boxes put underground.

Danielle – read an e-mail from Ronald L. Anderson, a community member in Talmadge saying that 3HH in Talmadge is not occurring until Oct 2010, and it may still be possible to affect that process. Therefore, I urge that the subcommittee include this in their consideration.

Sean Harrison – I've been told by people who do this for a living that it is actually cheaper to put them underground. However, it is cheaper to maintain them if they are in above ground boxes.

Pam Hubbell – I appreciated the presentation tonight. I can't lose track of the fact that the wires are unsightly to me. I think there is a lot we can do to make it better if we do go with the above ground boxes, if we have to go with them. I heard from one Talmadge resident who was going to lose a tree due to their placement, and she stood on the sidewalk.

John Garrison – I thank the presenters tonight as well as the presenters from last month.

David Moty – We only have one real point of leverage, which is forming the utility district. You have to get the guarantees before that. I think it is very telling that all 3 Talmadge residents on the KTPG are very concerned about this. Don't go along for the ride, and don't lose your point of leverage.

---

#### SPEAKER SLIPS SUBMITTED ON THIS ITEM:

- Ralph Riebli, Don Taylor, Celia Conover submitted slips with no description; their verbal comments are captured above.
- Gretchen Pattengill – Undergrounding support for underground vaults or hidden placement

---

#### INFORMATION ITEM: ALDINE SLOPE IN TALMADGE



Stop sign issue – The city is going to respond within 30 to 45 days.

---

#### INFORMATION ITEM: ALDINE SLOPE RESTORATION

This project has been approved, and they will be starting on the timetable issued previously, which is for construction in about the 8 to 10 month timetable.

#### PROJECT REVIEW – TOM ADAM

The Project Review subcommittee did not meet.

#### KMAD – TOM HEBRANK

No update other than the vote already taken.

#### KTPG LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS

Due to the lateness of the hour, these were not given.

#### AGENDA FOR THE NEXT KTPG MEETING

It is expected that the KTPG will not meet in July. Tom Hebrank will call a meeting if an urgent item appears.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Tom Hebrank adjourned the meeting at 9:36.