

Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group



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

www.ktpg.org

Regular Meeting Minutes

2012-07-11

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)	3
Treasurer’s Report – Report from Prior Month.....	3
Community Forum / Non-Agenda Public Comment.....	3
Non-Subcommittee Items	3
Allard Jansen – Information Item on Kensington Terrace	3
Information Item: Kensington Place Lighting MAD	4
Subcommittee Reports.....	6
Project Review	6
Information Item: To approve/disapprove subcommittee recommendation to deny the permit for the AT&T and T-Mobile wireless communications facilities located at 4864 Lila Drive wireless communications facility ...	6
Information Item: Discussion of YMCA presentation at the April 25th subcommittee meeting	7
Membership and Communication	8
Action Item – Creation of a Google Group	8



Transportation and Safety8

 Action Item: Possible adoption of KTPG recommendation on stop sign being recommended by the City for the intersection of 50th Street and Collier Avenue8

 Information Item: Report on July 8 Walk San Diego workshop.....9

 Action Item: Pylons on Adams.....9

Undergrounding9

By-laws.....10

KTPG Liaison Committee Reports10

Agenda for the next KTPG Meeting10

Adjournment10

Appendix A – Subcommittee Action on Cell Phone Towers At 4864 Lila Drive11

PARLIAMENTARY ITEMS

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

[Secretary’s note: KTPG minutes are not an exact transcript of the meeting. They are meant to capture votes taken as well as a general sense of what discussion occurred on various items.]

A regular meeting of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group (KTPG) was called to order by KTPG chair David Moty on July 11, 2012 at 6:30pm in the Franklin Elementary Auditorium (4481 Copeland Ave., San Diego, CA, 92116). The minutes were recorded by KTPG Secretary John M. Garrison.

Members present at the start of the meeting: Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, John M. Garrison, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Ken Horsley, Kevin Kelly, Richard Lesser, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush, Elvia Sandoval

Members absent at the start of the meeting: Daniele Laman, Guy Hanford. Daniele Laman arrived by 6:36pm.

Also present: Gavin ____ (Senior Community Representative for Susan A. Davis, Member of Congress, 53rd District, California), Susan Nguyen (from the Little Saigon Cultural Foundation) and approximately 20 members of the public.

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

David Moty mentioned that Sean Harrison has just found out from The City that they plan to place pylons along Adams Avenue just East of SR15. I would like to add that as an Action Item to the Traffic Subcommittee and to extend the time allotted to that portion of the agenda by five minutes. He also said he would like to include an



Information Item in the non-subcommittee portion of the agenda to allow Allard Jansen to give an update on the Kensington Terrace project and to have some Q&A. Kevin Kelly made a motion to that effect. Hearing no objections, David Moty deemed the agenda passed as modified.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING(S)

David Moty asked if anyone had any objections to approval of the June 2012 minutes as modified. Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

TREASURER’S REPORT – REPORT FROM PRIOR MONTH

Starting Balance: June 1, 2012 - \$399.94

Income

\$0.00 – donations from April meeting

Expenditures:

\$0.00

Ending Balance: \$399.94

COMMUNITY FORUM / NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Daniel Hazard (Senior Community Representative for Susan A. Davis, Member of Congress, 53rd District, California) gave a report on the representative’s activities.

Joan Fitzsimons – I wanted to address Guy Hanford and the Adams Avenue Business District, but he isn’t here. I notice that the BID elected to put in Evergreen Pears along the business district. These are notoriously bad trees for this area and they will never thrive. I wonder if the BID would consider removing them.

Susan Nguyen (from the Little Saigon Cultural Foundation) - Sdlanternfestival.com

David Moty – mentioned that the KTPG would not meet in August so the next meeting would be after the Lantern Festival.

Sean Harrison – I know that we are in transition from District 3 to District 9 and I think that we should start facilitating the transition with the City.

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS

ALLARD JANSEN – INFORMATION ITEM ON KENSINGTON TERRACE

Allard Jansen – we have put in a request to the County for a tank removal to shut the gas station. We had to go ahead and do that because it takes some time to get something like that approved. However, we are still not



completely set with our financing, though we are very hopeful. We might be only weeks away from having that set. So you may see a fence go up around the gas station in a few weeks to safeguard the site during removal.

Sean Harrison – If you get the permit, how long is it good for? Allard: I think 90 days.

Keith Roudebush – the fence would go up when you begin demolishing the tank and the gas station would be closed? Allard: Yes.

Bob Coffin – What would be the construction time for the project. Allard: we are getting bids from contractors and the time estimates have ranged from 10 to 14 months.

Bob Coffin – Who are the tenants? Allard: We can't sign tenant leases yet because we don't have financing.

Kevin Kelly – Would the fence go up before you have financing? Allard: No. When the fence goes up that means we have financing.

In favor - Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, John M. Garrison, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Ken Horsley, Kevin Kelly, Richard Lesser, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush, Elvia Sandoval, Daniele Laman

Opposed – Frank Doft

Abstaining – Sean Harrison, I am abstaining because the motion is wordy. I support the effort but not the

Recusing – Kevin Kelly

Absent – Guy Hanford

John M. Garrison – the KTPG should send someone to planning commission to make clear what our position was and why.

INFORMATION ITEM: KENSINGTON PLACE LIGHTING MAD

Patricia Webb – spoke on the possible formation of a MAD in the portion of Kensington bounded by Monroe Ave to the north, El Cajon Blvd to the south, Central Avenue to the west, and 43rd St. to the east. The proposed MAD would be for street lighting only and would work to replace Cobra-style lighting with historic-type lighting used elsewhere in Kensington. There is a website at www.wearekensington.com We are currently paying \$32 a year, per parcel, into a special assessment district. We would like to get part of that back and we would take over our lighting with it. The remainder would still go into the existing special assessment district for things like street sweeping. The additional assessment would be approximately \$55 per parcel per year. We need 72 lights at a cost of \$14,000 per light. \$1MM would be needed. It might take us 4 years, but that would be quicker than the approximate 14 years it would take for the El Cajon business district to get it done.

Don Taylor – I notice some of your coloring on the map is going past Monroe, but your proposed MAD would end at Monroe, is that right?

Patricia Webb – Yes, that coloring is denoting something else, it would not be part of the MAD.



Audience member – How many parcels are there?

Patricia Webb – I think about 175 but I'm not sure. I don't know how many are houses vs apartments.

Community member – So you don't have any street lights?

Patria Webb – in many places we don't have any lights.

Elvia Sandoval – You said this area

Patricia Webb - Except for the 5 blocks between El Cajon and Meade. Those were changed due to population increase, but the legal boundaries of Kensington did not change.

Elvia Sandoval – And you are going to try to get the zip code changed?

Patricia Webb – Absolutely. We paid a premium to buy a house in that zip code and we want to have that zip code.

Sherry Hopwood – When this area was laid out was it defined as Kensington?

Patricia Webb –In 1910 the borders for Kensington were drawn and they included this area. The City shows the historical map on their website.

Sherry Hopwood – I don't think that is right. I live in a historic house and it was built by the two women who laid out Kensington and I have done a lot of research on it.

Patricia Webb –I know you and I have gone round and round on this but this is what we have found.

Sherry Hopwood – I believe historic lights should be for an area that is historic.

Bob Coffin – Are you in the new boundaries of the new District 9?

Patricia Webb – Yes we are?

Ken Horsley – If this goes through, would there be any part of Kensington not covered by a MAD?

David Moty – No, there would not be.

Ken Horsley – There are several different types of lights being used in the different MADs. Did this area have historic lights?

Patricia Webb – We are talking about acorn lights. At the end of Monroe along Central there are some acorn lights. So we want to match that and match what is going on in Kensington Park South.

Daniele Laman – what sort of timeline were the houses built in?

Patricia Webb – Mid 20s to I am not sure.

Keith Roudebush – Have you looked into the cost for lights if you don't go with Cobra?

John M. Garrison- the price in the PowerPoint presentation was \$14,000 per lamp.



Sean Harrison – All due respect here, fantastic schedule keeping. I'm just looking down the road and we have multiple MADs that we are looking to do. Is there any possibility of them being consolidated into one?

Patricia Webb – It would be great if we could all go into one lighting MAD but Don Taylor had started first and I didn't want to step on anyone's toes.

Sean Harrison – I respect Sherry's point but I think it is an issue of semantics. I think the safety from having lights is good and having better lights is a good thing. And that is coming from someone who lives in Baja Kensington.

Sherry Hopwood – I live in Baja Kensington also and I support putting these types of lights in, but this area is not part of historic Kensington.

Patricia Webb – It is written on our deeds.

Sherry Hopwood – that doesn't matter, people can put whatever they want as a label on a deed, but that doesn't mean it was in the original boundaries of Kensington.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

PROJECT REVIEW

Ann Pease gave the Project Review Subcommittee Report.

INFORMATION ITEM: TO APPROVE/DISAPPROVE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO DENY THE PERMIT FOR THE AT&T AND T-MOBILE WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES LOCATED AT 4864 LILA DRIVE WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

Ann Pease - We have been discussing this for the better part of a year or longer. Ann gave a presentation on the plans. She also read the letter attached here as Addendum A. This was the motion passed by the Project Review subcommittee.

Deborah Gardner – I am here representing T-Mobile. We did submit a set of plans that had mitigations to the plan. I don't think it would be beneficial to argue about the proposal. I don't want this to be delayed and have to come back again. I would just like to see a decision made by your group so that we can proceed from there to the Planning Commission.

AT&T – we provide 4 different design options. We talked to one of the neighbors. We do feel like we provided alternatives. We spoke about this alternative at one of the subcommittee meetings and it didn't seem like my comments were much appreciated so I think I will just leave it at that.

Megan Beauvais and Mora ____ – the neighbors on either side of the property in question. The antennas are very visible to our properties. I know that the subcommittee worked tirelessly both with the neighbors and the property owner and with the cell phone companies. I did see some of the proposals with lollipop socks and they



look like big lollipops. I have my house on the market and potential buyers mention the downside of the cell phone towers being there. The equipment sheds are adjacent to my property. I have trellises that are higher than code just to try to shield part of the antennas. It looks like an industrial park.

Keith Roudebush – What have you done to mitigate the effects?

Deborah Gardner – we were going to paint the antennas green instead of white. We were also going to cover the antennas with the socks.

Keith Roudebush – What about the noise?

Deborah Gardner – we don't have noise associated with our installation. The T-Mobile equipment does not have air conditioning or condensers associated with it.

Keith Roudebush – I never mentioned air conditioning, I am just asking about noise in general. Have you tested the noise there with a decibel meter.

Deborah Gardner – No. But I can tell you that we comply with the regulations for a residential application.

Ann Pease – The subcommittee has visited the site and is aware that there is noise.

Deborah Gardner – I guess I am saying that any noise there is within allowable limits?

Sean Harrison- if the installation has been in place for 10 years, why do they need to get a CUP now?

Deborah Gardner – there was a 10-year CUP and it needs to be renewed.

David Moty – We have a motion on the floor that the planning group denies the requested permit and supports an alternative plan.

David Moty – I think it is a wonderful plan. It makes the antennas much less visible. Instead of fake trees, it allows the towers to blend into natural vegetation.

Frank Doft – How would lowering the antennas affect the coverage?

Deborah Gardner – we would have to increase the height of the towers. I don't have a topo map with me. We would have to get back close to the height we have to achieve the same coverage.

Kevin Kelly is recusing himself from this since he works with Qualcomm and they make chips for cell phones.

Ken Horsley – there is another installation on the north end of Norma Drive where the cell phone towers are below the floor elevation of the houses.

[Secretary's note: More information on this project is at <http://www.ktbg.org/projects/205425-ATT/ATT2.htm>]

INFORMATION ITEM: DISCUSSION OF YMCA PRESENTATION AT THE APRIL 25TH SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Ann Pease - There are concerns about several things with the recent plans:



- The amount of light from the soccer fields
- Parking, especially at times when the YMCA soccer fields and the Hoover High football fields are both in use.
- The façade, and the idea that it should have some significance and make a visual statement.
- The operating hours of the parking lot.
- The issue of signage, both the YMCA signage on the building and the signage we would like to see crossing an adjacent street, possibly a neighborhood sign. I mentioned that to them and the fact that several members of the subcommittee didn't like the low-key signage. They said they would like to stick with their normal, low-key signage.
- Access to the facility, isolated as it is, within a sea of major street crossings, and pedestrian crossing timings. These are largely City issues, but we just asked for the architects and planners to consider this in their workings with the City. We also talked about angled parking and whether it might help or not.

[Secretary's note: More information on this project can be found at:
<http://www.ktpg.org/projects/price/index.htm>]

MEMBERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION

Subcommittee chair John M. Garrison gave a report on the motion taken by the subcommittee.

ACTION ITEM – CREATION OF A GOOGLE GROUP

David Moty – proposed an amendment that we go to only 3 members with access to post to the group. Daniele Laman – I second that.

John M. Garrison – I have no issue with that change. [Discussed how we came up with the list we came up with.]

Amendment – passed unanimously

Motion as amended - unanimously

TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

Sean Harrison gave a subcommittee report.

ACTION ITEM: POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF KTPG RECOMMENDATION ON STOP SIGN BEING RECOMMENDED BY THE CITY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF 50TH STREET AND COLLIER AVENUE

Sean Harrison – We did not take a motion on this as a subcommittee, but the City does intend to place a stop sign there unless we oppose it.



David Moty – Does anyone want to propose a motion opposing the stop sign? Hearing no one wanting to propose a motion against it, we can remain silent on the issue.

INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT ON JULY 8 WALK SAN DIEGO WORKSHOP

Elvia Sandoval gave a report on the Walk San Diego July 8 meeting.

ACTION ITEM: PYLONS ON ADAMS

Sean Harrison – I found out today that the City plans to install orange pylons in the center stripe of Adams east of SR15 in front of Ponce’s restaurant. The information I have heard is that the City has a study from 2011 that indicated 2 accidents occurred there involving illegal left turns. I am concerned based on the topics subcommittee have discussed.

John M. Garrison – Moved we ask the City to consider holding off until the subcommittee has considered it. And I move we refer this to the Traffic Subcommittee.

Keith Roudebush – I know that the Kensington Terrace proposal includes a requirement for a light on Adams and I wonder how that might factor in.

Daniele Laman – the light went away when the Kensington Terrace proposal got smaller.

Kevin Kelly – seconded the motion

Bob Coffin – Does anyone here remember any pylons in that area?

Fred Lindahl – we have to remember that before the freeway (SR15) went in, there was a street that went north-south there. You could actually cross Adams like you do now on Kensington and Marlborough.

Bob Coffin – I think we should ask the City if they have tried any other traffic calming measures.

Frank Doft – I am completely for stopping traffic crossing there

In favor: Fred Lindahl, John M. Garrison, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Ken Horsley, Kevin Kelly, Richard Lesser, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush

Opposed: Elvia Sandoval, Frank Doft

Absent: Guy Hanford

UNDERGROUNDING

Subcommittee chair Bob Coffin gave a report on undergrounding. There will be a workshop at 7:00pm on July 24th at MOC II, 9192 Topaz Way, run by the CPC that will discuss Undergrounding. Bob Coffin reported that he got an email from Tom Hebrank and that Carl DeMaio asked for the City to provide an audit of the undergrounding project.



BY-LAWS

Subcommittee chair Frank Doft – the subcommittee did not meet so there is no report.

[Secretary's note: The KTPG bylaws and other governing rules may be found at <http://www.ktpg.org/about/about.htm>]

KTPG LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS

CPC – David Moty – CPC will run the workshop portion of the CPC meeting regarding undergrounding rather than having the utilities run it.

Guy Hanford – the Kensington Flower Group did some nice work putting some nice plants in the tree wells along part of Adams Avenue in Kensington. They are going to do more of it as well.

AGENDA FOR THE NEXT KTPG MEETING

David Moty – We will be dark in August, as we don't have a place to meet.

ADJOURNMENT

David Moty adjourned the meeting at 8:30 pm.



APPENDIX A – SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION ON CELL PHONE TOWERS AT 4864 LILA DRIVE

As you are aware, our approval of the two existing antennas at that address has been sought by the City, and at least two presentations have been made by their owners, AT&T and T-Mobile. The antennas have been in existence for approximately ten years, at which time a CUP was not required for their installation, and KTPG would have not been notified. Now our approval is requested.

Our primary concerns about the antennas have been:

1. The unattractive appearance of the antennas themselves, and their location in full view of the neighbors.
2. The unattractive appearance of the antennas from Montezuma Drive, from where they are clearly visible.
3. The unattractive appearance and excessive height of the enclosures for the operating equipment, particularly from the viewpoint of the closest neighbor.
4. The noise generated by the operating equipment.
5. The disturbance typically caused the entire neighborhood whenever work is conducted on the antennas or related equipment.

Due to the above concerns, we have struggled to approve the proposed CUP to legalize these existing antennas. However, as we are all aware, should we choose to simply recommend denial of this CUP, without offering an alternative, we shall have no success, since the City routinely approves such requests.

One potential solution to the concerns listed above would be to recommend to the City denial of the CUP while offering up the following alternative: Move the antennas offsite, into the open space to the northeast of their current locations. Simply placing the antennas some short distance down the hillside above Montezuma Drive would:

1. Make them less visible from the perspective of the neighbors,
2. Cause them to be concealed by the natural landscaping on the slope after a relatively short period of time, thus allowing the antennas to be constructed without such devices as fake trees and screening,
3. Free up space in the rear yard of 4864 Lila Drive, enabling the equipment enclosures to be moved to the center of the yard, thus causing less problem with noise and excessive height for the neighbors.

The only remaining unsolved problem would be the disturbance typically caused whenever work is conducted on the antennas or equipment. This could be minimized by a requirement in the CUP that such work be conducted only during specific hours, whenever of least concern to the neighbors.