

Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group



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

www.ktpg.org

Regular Meeting Minutes - 2011-11-09

Approved by KTPG on December 12, 2011

CONTENTS

- Parliamentary Items2
 - Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions2
 - 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.....2
 - Community Forum / Non-Agenda Public Comment.....3
- Non-Subcommittee Items3
 - Kensington Lighting MAD3
 - Urban Agriculture proposal6
 - Discussion of letter from Mary Wright, Deputy Director, Development Services Department – Planning Division8
- Subcommittee Reports.....8
 - Membership and Communication8
 - Action Item: Approval/Disapproval of a letter regarding 4496 Euclid Avenue8
- Adjournment13
- APPENDIX A14



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 David Moty on November 9, 2011 at 6:30pm in the Franklin Elementary Auditorium (4481 Copeland Ave., San Diego, CA, 92116). The minutes were recorded by John M. Garrison.

Members present at the start of the meeting: Bob Coffin, Frank Doft, Daniele Laman, Fred Lindahl, Guy Hanford, Kevin Kelly, Sherry Hopwood, Pam Hubbell, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush Elvia Sandoval

Members absent at the start of the meeting: Gail Greer, Sean Harrison

Also present: Approximately 50 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 Frank Doft and seconded by Guy Hanford. The motion was approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING(S)

David Moty asked if anyone had any objections to approval of the October 2011 minutes. David then mentioned that he believed there was a gap in the October minutes and that we were not ready to approve them. This item was deferred.

TREASURER’S REPORT – REPORT FROM PRIOR MONTH

Starting Balance: October 1, 2011 - \$505.13

Income

Donations from September’s meeting: \$24.00

Expenditures:

Check number # 3102 Post Master for PO Box \$96.00

Check number #3103 Pam Hubbell Sandwich Boards \$100.00



Ending Balance: \$333.13

COMMUNITY FORUM / NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments on Franklin Elementary

Dixie Blake - it appears that the school district will not be closing any schools at this time.

Gigette Caldwell – introduced herself as the new President of the Ken-Tal Community Association. She said the group hosts dinners the third Thursday of every month (except December). The fee is \$10 for dinner this month; reservations are being taken at the Kensington Video Store.

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS

KENSINGTON LIGHTING MAD

[Secretary's note: More information on this item is at <http://www.ktpg.org/KMAD/lighting.htm>]

Community member, Don Taylor, gave a presentation the public on the possible formation of maintenance assessment districts (MAD) in portions of the Kensington neighborhood. The purpose of these proposed MADs would be for street lighting only, in particular to provide for the maintenance, replacement, and installation of non-cobra historic-style lighting.

A set of residents began looking at the situation of a MAD to better maintain the historic streetlights in our neighborhood and to avoid either having dark streets or having the lights replaced by generic cobra-style lights. The residents initially were thinking about one MAD for Kensington. As they studied the issue, a consensus soon developed that it would be better to form a MAD for each neighborhood (e.g. Kensington Heights, Kensington Manor...)

We currently are part of a special lighting district fund, but the money in that can be spent anywhere in the city and it isn't enough to maintain all the lights. Each homeowner currently pays about \$10 / year into the lighting district. That amount is supposed to pay for all energy costs, maintenance and replacement above city-standard (the cobra-style light). Currently 59 of 77 street lights in Kensington Heights are of the original type (Empire Lantern type). We estimate we would need up to \$30,000 per year just to maintain the existing lights. If any need to be replaced then the cost for that would be much higher. In Kensington Manor, 25 of 36 lights are the original Aegean Acorn style. In Talmadge Park, only 3 of the existing lights are not the original (Concrete Delphi) style.

Audience question: Are you including the area South of Monroe?

Don Taylor: No, that area has only cobra-style lighting and wider streets and we did not include it in this analysis. However, since we are doing this neighborhood-by-neighborhood, there would be nothing to stop that area from doing it as well.

Audience question: What other areas have done it and how much did they pay and what was the result?



Don Taylor: I don't know of too many. I know of one that decided they wanted a quicker fix and decided to assess themselves \$300 / year. We didn't think that would pass with the community in this economy.

Audience question: Some of the lights seem to have a yellowish-color. Why is that?

Don Taylor: They have a lower energy use.

Audience member: That was also requested by the observatories.

Audience question: If we do this neighborhood by neighborhood don't we lose consistency?

Don Taylor: We felt that it would be unfair to take money from one area that may have enough lights and use it to pay for additional lights in a different area.

Audience question: My second question pertains to standardization of lighting. Have you given any consideration to standardizing on one design and making the lights match throughout the neighborhood?

Don Taylor: Our general feeling is that each neighborhood values what they have had historically and would be apt to stick with what they have had historically.

Pam Hubbell – I know the MAD has been discussed in various forms. And I think this is a novel approach. But I'm also sort of sad because we are Kensington and I don't think that we have 5 community characters, we have 1 community character. I would hate to see a MAD get created in, for example, Kensington Heights and not elsewhere, so maybe the part of the neighborhood that everyone doesn't get one might not get the lighting.

Don Taylor: All the organizers want to help it happen everywhere. But if we do it all as on MAD we may get into arguments later about whether the money needs to go mainly to maintenance for existing lights, or mainly to adding new lights for neighborhoods who don't have as many lights.

Pam Hubbell – I agree with all those justifications, but the "you" and "our" in that doesn't sit well with me. I think we are one neighborhood.

Audience question: Are there any areas that have a lighting MAD in the area?

Don Taylor: Talmadge (TMAD) does include lighting.

Audience question: If we get the necessary signatures on the petitions, how likely is it that the City approve creating the district?

Don Taylor: If the vote passes by a good margin they would typically support it, they just want to see that it does have community support.

Audience question: In the 5 areas, do you have community organizers; are you looking for people to fill that role?

Don Taylor: We do have people, but we can always use more hands.

Audience question: If we are paying \$10 / year for Lighting District One, and our assessment is \$85, then our real cost would be only \$75?



Don Taylor: That is true. But the assessment varies. If the assessment for an area is only \$75 and you stop paying the \$10 is that the difference would be \$65.

Audience question: I have heard that we won't get undergrounding unless we have a lighting MAD?

Don Taylor: That was not what I heard. What I heard was that if the undergrounding started and there was not a MAD in place, and lights needed to be put in, that they did not relish another major fight with the neighborhood of Kensington.

Audience question: Can you tell us what the status is on the undergrounding? There seem to be a few opinions on that. Some people don't want it to happen unless the boxes themselves are underground.

Don Taylor: We have an entire subcommittee around just Undergrounding.

Audience question: Why should we create MADs for lighting if we are never going to go undergrounding?

Bob Coffin: I am the chair of the Undergrounding subcommittee. What the City has told us is that if we don't have a MAD in place by the time undergrounding happens, and if there is a broken or missing lamp, that they will just stub out to that point and not fix the light. If there is a working light then they will connect it into the undergrounding utilities.

Audience question: How much does it cost to buy a new cobra light vs. repairing and replacing historic lights? In other words, are we going to be paying a huge amount of money for something that the City would otherwise be paying for?

Don Taylor: I think the cost of a cobra light is between \$1,500 and \$3,000.

Audience question: Why wouldn't we just go for the cheaper light that the City has to maintain?

Don Taylor: This is why it is up to each neighborhood to make a decision. Just as we found with the Kensington sign, there are some people who are interested in making a change and some people who are interested in maintain the historic element.

Keith Roudebush: What concerns me is that when you pay in your money, it gets co-mingled in with other money in the City.

Don Taylor: No, that's not correct. You can go onto the website and see the finances for any MAD that there is now. They are kept separate.

Keith Roudebush: Who monitors that?

Don Taylor: Our hope is that the KTPG would form a subcommittee to monitor it.

Daniele Laman: Why would KTPG be the controlling group? We don't control the KMAD? And what if the KTPG happened to have a majority of the members from Talmadge, then Talmadge people would be overseeing Kensington money.



David Moty: One thing we found is that the City is no longer allowing MADs to be formed into zones, so we couldn't have one MAD with different zones. The idea of having it under the KTPG would be to eliminate redundancy and create a whole other structure.

Audience question: Why would we replace lights with today's technology? There are solar lights we could use. In another 100 years there could be better technology...

Daniele Laman: North Park had solar panels in their lighting district and it never worked out.

Ralph Riebli: Can you elaborate what role Parks and Recreation has in this and what role would the City still play in this?

Don Taylor: Unlike some things like tree trimming, the maintenance of City lights has to be done by the City. Right now we are in lighting district 1 and we have no say in it. We would have say in this.

Ralph Riebli: When the work is done, would we have to use the City and their union workers?

Don Taylor: They City may contract it out but it has to go through them.

Audience question: Has anyone looked into federal grants.

Don Taylor: Not yet, but if you would like to take that on we would appreciate the help.

Audience question: When these were put in 100 years ago what were they made of?

Don Taylor: I'm not sure of the exact composition but they rust so they must contain iron.

URBAN AGRICULTURE PROPOSAL

[Secretary's note: More information on this item is at <http://www.ktpg.org/projects/urbanag/index.html>]

This item was referred to KTPG by the City Council's Land Use & Housing (LU&H) committee to the Community Planners Committee (CPC) for review and recommendation. The proposal sets parameters for the keeping of chickens, goats, and bees inside the city limits.

Potential action item: To develop and adopt a position by the KTPG on the proposal before the CPC and LU&H.

David Moty: Do we have any questions or comments on the material I sent out.

John M. Garrison: I read it. I'm generally in favor of it.

Daniele Laman: Does this apply to anyone? If I want to have goats to mow my lawn I can do that?

David Moty: Yes, if your property meets the conditions such as size and setbacks.

Daniele Laman: I got together with Eastern Area Planning Committee and we had some thoughts: All farmers' markets should be required to have restrooms. Parking needs to be adequate. I'd like to see no cooking because that brings in restaurant rules. We'd like to see no more than 5 chickens total. We'd like permits so we can have money to enforce the requirements. With regard to the male goats being dehorned and neutered – where is that



to be done? Is that to be done on the properties or where is that allowed. We had questions about limits on bees, how to track whether they are Africanized, etc. We took about an hour to talk about this.

Guy Hanford: I want to get a clarification – this does not affect street fairs where they have cooking?

David Moty: Street fairs are different, they get permits.

Sherry Hopwood: I have heard that 90% of the honey bees in San Diego County are Africanized. Is there a way to keep selling of live animals out of the farmer's markets?

Daniele Laman: I think the farmer's market is only about produce, not animals.

Keith Roudebush: I want us to have a formal position.

Keith Roudebush: I believe the whole thing is a joke.

Elvia Sandoval – I'd like to vote it all down.

Park Coffin (audience member) – I've worked on this ordinance as part of the 1 in 10 coalition. People who want to keep bees don't want to keep Africanized bees. They want to keep European bees and those are a barrier to Africanized bees coming in. We wanted to be very conservative. We limited it to chickens only, no ducks, and no roosters. We limited the goats to only miniature goats. The limits on distances were taken from other city ordinances so they have precedent. The daily farmer's market is supposed to be limited to something like 10 or 15 feet and it is not really supposed to

John M. Garrison – moved to ask David to represent we are generally in favor of the proposed regulations

Daniele Laman – seconded the motion.

In favor: John M. Garrison, Daniele Laman Bob Coffin.

Against: Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, Guy Hanford, Kevin Kelly, Sherry Hopwood, Pam Hubbell, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush Elvia Sandoval

The motion failed

Bob Coffin: I have an important update I need to give on the Aldine Slope.

David Moty: We have to finish this item first.

Pam Hubbell: moved we support the bees and goats but with the following changes: The rules currently proposed for 15 goats to apply to 5, and there would be no level for 15 goats. The 5 chickens would have the rules as

Danielle Laman – seconded the motion

In favor: John M. Garrison, Pam Hubbell, Daniele Laman, David Moty

Opposed: Elvia Sandoval, Sherry Hopwood, Keith Roudebush, Fred Lindahl, Kevin Kelly, Guy Hanford

Abstaining: Frank Doft, Bob Coffin



The motion failed.

Daniele Laman – are we OK with changing the rules for different kinds of farmers’ markets?

David Moty: If we don’t address them then we are basically saying we are OK with them.

Fred Lindahl: I move we support the recommendations but with no bees, no goats, and only 3 chickens.

Sherry Hopwood seconded the motion

In favor: Guy Hanford, Kevin Kelly, Daniele Laman, Fred Lindahl, Ann Pease, David Moty, Sherry Hopwood

Opposed: Elvia Sandoval, Keith Roudebush, John M. Garrison, Pam Hubbell, Frank Doft

Abstaining: Bob Coffin

The motion passed 7-5-1

DISCUSSION OF LETTER FROM MARY WRIGHT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT – PLANNING DIVISION

David Moty: This is a letter concerning copyright and the duplication and/or alteration of plans. It was apparently prompted by something that occurred in La Jolla. They are asking us to ensure that we are in compliance with copyright law and that we aren’t posting any copyrighted architectural plans or other materials. I think this is mostly a matter for Ann Pease (as Project Review subcommittee chair) and John Garrison (as Secretary and webmaster). Ann and John, are you confident we are in compliance?

John M. Garrison: We have a form, which Bob Coffin helped us to create, that we ask people to fill out releasing materials under a Creative Commons license to ensure that we have the ability to post them and also ensuring that the community is able to download the material from the website. We try to get people to fill in that form, but not everyone takes it seriously. If someone gives us material without signing the form and we believe their intent is that we can post it, then we do. We could comply with a DCMA take-down notice if we received one. We don’t go out looking for architectural drawings that were not provided to us in some form.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

MEMBERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION

ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL OF A LETTER REGARDING 4496 EUCLID AVENUE

[Secretary’s note: More information is at <http://www.ktpg.org/projects/4496-euclid/>]

Consideration by the full board of a letter drafted by the Membership & Communications subcommittee to support ongoing action by the city’s code compliance division regarding property at 4496 Euclid Avenue.

Dan Trujillo of Talmadge Community Association gave a presentation on the property.



Bob Coffin - Roger Utt is the property owner?

Dan Trujillo - Yes

Bob Coffin - And he is an architect?

Dan Trujillo - Yes.

Bob Coffin: And he used to be on this board, and in fact the chair of the board.

Dan Trujillo - Yes.

Bob Coffin: What does he say about all that?

Dan Trujillo - At various points in time he has not responded at all, or said he had family issues, or said the economy was holding it up.

John M. Garrison read a communications exchange between himself and Roger Utt that occurred when Garrison notified Utt that the matter was coming before the subcommittee:

[The thread shown here with newest messages at the top, but it was read oldest-to-newest.]

To: Garrison, John

Cc: David Moty

Subject: Re: Your property on the Communications subcommittee agenda for this week

John—I will not attend the meeting. Roger

On 10/26/11 3:48 PM, "Garrison, John" wrote:

Hi Roger,

Will you be attending the meeting tonight?

Thanks,

John

From: Roger Utt

Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 3:37 PM

To: Garrison, John

Cc: David Moty

Subject: Re: Your property on the Communications subcommittee agenda for this week

John—As I have indicated, zoning code enforcement has already issued an enforcement letter.

As a result of recent community action, the property has had three vandalism events and my family has been exposed to improper phone calls. My family contracted with a builder for improvements to proceed forward in August and the inspection department was notified in



early September that construction was to proceed forward. Zoning code enforcement called and put a stop to the progress based upon community communications. It is ironic that the community action has halted what they are seeking. Now that this issue is within the control of several different departments, it will take months to get the City departments to respond and to release the project to move forward. Meanwhile, I have lost my contractor, who has moved on to other projects and financing is on the fence. If this action group really wants action, have them draft a letter to zoning code enforcement to rescind the enforcement letter and to reactivate the permit to allow the project to move forward. Roger

On 10/25/11 12:29 PM, "Garrison, John" wrote:

Hi Roger,

Thanks for your reply. I imagine that this is a trying time for you. I hope we can somehow be part of an amicable solution.

The item was brought forward by members of the community at the 2 most recent KTPG meetings. As a result, the KTPG chair assigned it to our subcommittee for consideration.

I don't speak for the community members who raised the concern, so you would have to ask them what their plans are or why they have chosen to bring this to KTPG. My impression is that those community members are frustrated and are looking for a path that will help produce a favorable outcome with tangible results in the short term.

I am not privy to the communications between the City and you or your family. I don't think the community members are privy to those communications either. If you want to release that information so that everyone is up-to-date on what is happening you can certainly do so. You could do that either by coming to the subcommittee meeting to present it or by sending it to me ahead of time for me to present to the subcommittee.

Do you plan to attend the meeting tomorrow?

Best regards,

John

From: Roger Utt

Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2011 12:14 PM

To: Garrison, John

Subject: Re: Your property on the Communications subcommittee agenda for this week

John— My family has already received a letter from code compliance regarding this issue. What



now is the purpose to write a letter? Roger

On 10/24/11 8:43 PM, "Garrison, John" wrote:

Hi Roger,

I don't know if you were at the last KTPG meeting or not. (I had to miss it due to a death in the family) At that meeting, the KTPG assigned an item to the Communication subcommittee:

Drafting of letter to the City of San Diego regarding code compliance issues at

4496 Euclid Avenue for referral to the full board.

I have attached the full agenda here. It is also posted in the usual public places.

Best regards,

John

David Moty: Just to let you know how widespread knowledge of this situation is: I was at a Little Saigon event and someone asked me about this property and I told them a code compliance action had been issued, and there was actually applause.

Kevin Kelly: What now is the purpose of writing the letter? It seems sort of like gilding the lily. Surely the City doesn't need us to send them a letter asking them to do their job on this?

The City says that a letter from the planning group could accelerate things by adding some weight to the matter.

Audience question: Utt used to be on this board. There are still some members from the Utt era on the board. I'm curious to see how the members vote and whether some of you vote with Utt or with the community. I urge you to pass the letter.

Audience question: Is this the first code compliance letter the city has written?

Dan Trujillo - Yes.

Bob Coffin: Since Roger is not here, but since he has been involved in the community for a long time, is there anyone who can give his perspectives.

Frank Doft: Why haven't the neighbors taken direct action, such as filing a lawsuit?

Dan Trujillo - Well, we wanted to work through the City first. For a while, we were giving information by the community that there was an active construction permit, and during that time, the property can look like almost anything.



Guy Hanford: I am from the Utt era, but it wouldn't matter to me if my parents owned the property. I would have to vote to do something about it. My question is if we write the letter, what can the City do? I've heard of cases where if people don't mow their yards that the City will come and do it and send the owner a bill. Is this the type of situation we have here?

Dan Trujillo - I don't know what the City might do next. I don't believe they could allow the back part of the house to be completed based on the deterioration that the property has suffered.

John M. Garrison – read the letter approved by the subcommittee [Attached here as Appendix A]. Since it came to KTPG as an action of a subcommittee, it is an active motion and does not need a second.

Guy Hanford: I know Roger is a smart person, and I worry that if this gets into a war of letters and he decides to dig his heels in that this could go on for a long time. I do think you have gone through extraordinary efforts to do something about this.

Guy Hanford: Was there a consideration of adding a mention of “safety concerns”?

John M. Garrison: We did consider that, but decided that might be a step too far to make ourselves safety experts.

Bob Coffin: I think we need to take them through in bullet points all the elements of being a nuisance. I think you have to lead the judge through it.

Fred Lindahl: I sat on the board with Roger Utt in the past just because we sat on the board together that does not mean we are intimate friends, but just acquaintances. I am kind of with Bob in that we are calling it blighted in the heading. We need to have some bullet points explaining how we determine it is blighted. There are 3 bullet points and it seems that the final bullet point is really what we want. Do the first points of communicating with us take away from their time in making them comply?

Keith Roudebush: I think we should say it has been going on for 6 years.

David Moty: I like Bob's idea of putting it in bullets. I also think shortening the letter is a good thing, as much as possible.

Bob Coffin: It is my practice to ask for immediate action. Immediate remedy.

Fred Lindahl: I think when we say the City should take action, who specifically do we mean? If we address it to 3 people, they may all point fingers at each other. Also, you don't have Code Compliance listed anywhere.

Frank Doft: At the end of the first paragraph, last sentence

Fred Lindahl: I think speaking the City's language back to them would be a good strategy

Bob Coffin: Proposed an Amendment that KTPG approve the letter from the subcommittee with changes:

- Rewrite the letter to make it more forceful
- Put the strongest point at the very begging
- Track the nuisance statue as well as you can and state the particular things that track to the ordinance
- Turn it into bullets
- Remove the dates



- Attach a picture
- End with a strong ending stating it is a nuisance, asking Jan Goldsmith & the Deputy to immediately abate the problem, and keep us informed

The amendment was seconded by Sherry Hopwood

In favor: Bob Coffin, Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, Guy Hanford, Kevin Kelly, Sherry Hopwood, Pam Hubbell, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush Elvia Sandoval

Abstaining: Daniele Laman

The amendment passed 11-0-1.

At that point there was a vote to approve or reject the motion as amended:

Abstaining: Daniele Laman

In favor: Bob Coffin, Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, Guy Hanford, Kevin Kelly, Sherry Hopwood, Pam Hubbell, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush Elvia Sandoval

The motion was approved 11-0-1

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by John M. Garrison and seconded by Daniele Laman. Dave Moty adjourned the meeting at 9:00 pm.



APPENDIX A

Letter from KTPG to San Diego City Attorney's office Regarding 4496 Euclid Avenue (Version approved by the Communications Subcommittee)

Dianne Silva-Martinez
Deputy City Attorney
[Insert contact info]

The Honorable Jerry Sanders
Mayor, City of San Diego
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

The Honorable Todd Gloria
Councilmember, City of San Diego
2020 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Blighted property at 4496 Euclid Avenue, San Diego, CA, 92115

Ladies and gentlemen:

Many members of the communities of Talmadge and Kensington are concerned about the dilapidated status of the property at 4496 Euclid Avenue, which sits at the corner of Monroe Avenue and Euclid Avenue, the primary gateway to the Talmadge Community. These concerned citizens are also joined by the Talmadge Neighborhood Watch and The Talmadge Community Council. In the opinion of these groups, the property is in a blighted state and has become an eyesore to all who pass by this historic corner of Talmadge. The construction on the property has been incomplete and the property had been in disrepair for well over six years. During that time, it has constituted a public nuisance and has become a magnet for crime.

The above-named groups have tried to address the situation directly with the owner and have not seen an improvement in the property. They have also taken their concerns to the City Attorney's office and Neighborhood Code Compliance. Although the City has said they are working on the situation, the community remains unclear on the specific actions the City is taking to correct this problem. The community would like to be informed of the plan to resolve the issue and also of the expected timeline. To that end, they have brought the matter to the attention of KTPG to help ensure better communication and to seek a speedier resolution. The KTPG has now considered the item and has voted to send this letter requesting your help.

We request that the City of San Diego take the following actions:

- By November 30, 2011 – inform the KTPG chair of what action the city has taken so far to address the situation, and the planned process with regards to the property. We request that this include an explanation of whether the owner will be asked to



restore the property to its prior state or to move forward with completing the planned changes We also request the city give the KTPG chair monthly ongoing reports on the project until the situation is resolved.

- By December 10, 2011, or sooner – Require the owner to begin rectifying the problems.
- By February 10, 2012, or sooner – Require the owner to bring the property into complete compliance with all applicable laws. If this is not feasible, please report to us your alternative timeline.

We have collected and considered a variety of materials pertaining to this property, and you can find supplemental material [attached here](#), as well as on our website, at <http://www.ktpg.org/projects/4496-euclid/>

Thank you very much for your consideration and attention to this matter. We appreciate your help in preserving and improving the character of our beautiful neighborhood and our wonderful city.

Sincerely,

David Moty

Chair, Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group

Tel - 619-255-2882





APPENDIX B

Letter from KTPG to San Diego City Attorney's office
Regarding 4496 Euclid Avenue
(Version approved by KTPG)

November 30, 2011

Honorable Jan Goldsmith
City Attorney, City of San Diego
1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1620
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear City Attorney Goldsmith:

The Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group requests your assistance in addressing our concerns regarding a blighted property at 4496 Euclid Avenue. Situated at the southwest corner of Euclid and Monroe Avenues, it is located at the gateway to the Talmadge neighborhood.

This property is a vacant remodel (the owner lives elsewhere) that was purchased in 2002, underwent some initial work in 2005, and has been ignored since 2006. A code compliance violation was issued on this property on October 10, 2011. However, beyond this, the community believes that because of a long list of health and safety concerns, there is sufficient evidence to warrant treating this building as a public nuisance property.

These health and safety concerns include:

- Deep, open trenches (originally dug for footings) which
 - pose a danger to anyone walking the property, and
 - fill with water during the rainy season causing ponding of unclean water, and when rainfall is sufficient, drains onto an adjacent commercial property;
- Torn tarp and building debris which hangs from and litters the property;
- Exposure of weather-worn, rotted siding and roof components;
- Graffiti which demonstrates the attraction of crime to the property;
- Incidents of homeless persons sleeping on the property who our volunteer Talmadge Patrol have had to remove with law enforcement help;



- Vandalism/broken windows which presented an attraction to crime and which permitted vermin to enter and exit over a 3-4 month period;
- Weeds that often grow to 2-3 feet and pose a fire risk; and
- Storage of a non-operational vehicle.

We respectfully ask that the City Attorney's Office examine this property and commence immediate action to ensure the health and safety of our community.

We refer you to our website at <http://www.ktpg.org/projects/4496-euclid/> for additional details about this issue, including six photographs of the property which were taken in the past two months.

Respectfully,

David K. Moty

Chair, Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group

cc: Todd Gloria, Councilmember, 3rd District, City of San Diego
Robert Vacchi, Deputy Director, Development Services Department,
City of San Diego