

# Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group



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

[www.ktpg.org](http://www.ktpg.org)

## Regular Meeting Minutes

2013-07-24

### CONTENTS

Parliamentary Items .....	1
Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions .....	1
Modifications to and Adoption of Agenda (Additions / Deletions to Agenda).....	2
Approval of Minutes – Minutes from prior meeting(s) .....	2
Community Forum / Non-Agenda Public Comment.....	2
Non-Subcommittee Items .....	2
Subcommittee Reports.....	2
Project Review .....	2
Action Item: Applicants for 4704 Winona Avenue are seeking approval for tentative map waiver and Neighborhood Development Permit to convert two existing housing units on one lot into a condominium. Current zoning is RS-1-7 .....	2
Adjournment .....	4

### 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 special meeting of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group (KTPG) was called to order by KTPG chair David Moty on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2013 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, John M. Garrison, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Fred Lindahl, Ken Horsley, Daniele Laman, Richard Lesser, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush, Don Taylor, Kelly Waggoner

**Members absent at the start of the meeting:** Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford

**Also present:** The applicant for the project at 4704 Winona Avenue, and approximately 4 members of the public.

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

David Moty asked if there were any amendments to the agenda. John M. Garrison asked if the board members would agree to modify the agenda to include approval of the July 10<sup>th</sup> KTPG meeting minutes. David Moty replied that he had some more changes to the minutes beyond those that had already been incorporated. Garrison replied that he would withdraw his request to include that item in the agenda. Hearing no further changes, the agenda was approved as published.

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

Deferred (see above).

#### COMMUNITY FORUM / NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

#### NON-SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS

None.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

#### PROJECT REVIEW

**ACTION ITEM: APPLICANTS FOR 4704 WINONA AVENUE ARE SEEKING APPROVAL FOR TENTATIVE MAP WAIVER AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TO CONVERT TWO EXISTING HOUSING UNITS ON ONE LOT INTO A CONDOMINIUM. CURRENT ZONING IS RS-1-7**

Approve/Disapprove subcommittee recommendation by a 6-0 vote to approve a Neighborhood Development Permit and tentative map waiver to proceed with a condominium conversion at 4704 Winona Avenue contingent upon the front setback being in compliance with the established setback for this block.

The applicant, having been absent for the regular meeting July 10<sup>th</sup> where the item was to originally be considered, was present for the special meeting on July 24<sup>th</sup>.



Ann Pease discussed setbacks on the street and presented a proposed drawing to the applicant with the suggestion that the applicant adhere to existing setbacks on the street. The current conditions on the street feature bigger setbacks than are required under the law.

The applicant looked at the drawing that was proposed to him and he said he couldn't see much on the drawing without having scale given. He said that setbacks are a matter for building permits. And that this action pertains to the condominium conversion process, which doesn't have any connection to building permits.

David Moty mentioned changes in the footprint of the building and that the variance that allowed the building of a second building negated the ability to build all the way to the setback.

Sean Harrison – What is your FAR (Floor Area Ratio)? Answer: It would be near or at the maximum allowed.

[Member of the Public] – I am the block captain for that area. I have heard some people in the neighborhood say they don't want condos. I have heard other people state that they just want it to look better than it does...

Keith Roudebush – if we approve this, what timeline are you on?

Applicant – August 7<sup>th</sup> is my planning commission date. I can pour a slab the next day and be done in about 3 months.

Sean Harrison – the other properties you are working on are they also expected to be condominium conversions?

Applicant – no, this is the only one that is amenable to that. And I wouldn't do attached condos in this neighborhood. There is a place for that, but not in this neighborhood.

**David Moty made a motion to replace the motion from the subcommittee. Sherry Hopwood seconded the motion**

Don Taylor – I am just concerned that we may be drilling down too far into specifics of the property. I think the neighbors would like to see two nicer buildings even if they are someone less setback than others on the street are today. I don't see that this is any negative impact on the neighborhood.

Kelly Waggoner – I have a real concern with designing someone's property for them.

Sherry Hopwood – I feel that we are here with the purpose of preserving our neighborhood. I have an issue with changing the street line. Condos are a big problem for the community because there is never enough parking.

Sean Harrison – personally I am against large "McMansions", but I am also for property rights. I don't see a problem with having the 2 units as condos because it is just semantics. It doesn't densify things further than the property already is.

John M. Garrison – I think it is fair to trade the variance for adhering to a more rigorous setback. I'm not thrilled with the part about designing the doorway because I think that gets to be too specific. But I prefer the amendment over the original motion, so I would vote for it. Perhaps if there is interest we could amend again to remove the language about the doorway.

**A vote was called on the amendment to the motion.**



Voting in favor of the amendment: Hopwood, Laman, Lindahl, Pease, Roudebush, Horsley, Moty, Garrison,

Opposed to the amendment: Taylor, Lesser, Waggoner, Harrison, Doft

The amendment passed 8-5

[Secretary's note: At this point, Daniele Laman left the meeting due to an urgent time constraint.]

A vote was then called on the motion as amended.

In favor of the motion as amended: Hopwood, Lindahl, Pease, Roudebush, Horsley, Moty, Garrison

Opposed to the amendment: Taylor, Lesser, Waggoner, Harrison, Doft

The vote on the motion was 7-5.\*\*

[\*\*Secretary's note: everyone present thought this was a "passing" vote since we had a quorum and since the vote passed by a majority of those present. However, on September 26<sup>th</sup> David Moty sent a note to the KTPG saying he had reviewed Memorandum MS 59 from the Office of The City Attorney, City of San Diego, dated April 8, 2013. The substance of the memo is that City Planning Groups (of which KTPG is one) have rules that call for votes to pass by a majority "of the elected members of the group". Therefore, 8 votes are needed to pass a motion, even if (in this case) only 12 elected members are present. As a result of reviewing the memorandum, KTPG concluded this was a failed vote. We rescheduled the item for consideration again at our September meeting. The item ended up not being reviewed at that meeting because in the intervening time the applicant modified their project to no longer require KTPG approval.]

Richard Lesser – I want it in the record that I think we are being too particular in considering projects. We could be in a situation where we cause a delay and the project gets stalled as with Allard's project.

John M. Garrison – I want it in the record that we are better off with no project than with Allard's original oversized project.

Sherry Hopwood – I agree with that.

## ADJOURNMENT

David Moty adjourned the meeting at 7:14pm