

Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group



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

www.ktpg.org

Regular Meeting Minutes

2013-12-11

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
 - Community Forum / Non-Agenda Public Comment2
- Non-Subcommittee Items2
 - Formation of Election Subcommittee.....3
- Subcommittee Reports.....3
 - Transportation3
 - Action Item: Kensington Commons Traffic Plan3
 - Information Item: Report on subcommittee and task force discussions regarding Kensington parking issues in the area surrounding Adams Avenue4
 - Information Item: Report on December 4th meeting with staff for Toni Atkins, and an additional meeting with College area community organizations regarding El Cajon Blvd4
 - Action Item - Red Curb on the NE Corner of 42nd Street and Adams5
- CIP.....5
 - Action Item: Project list for the Public Facilities Financing Plan5



Information Item: Discussion on the role the KTPG should play in Neighborhood Code Compliance issues6

Information item: Civic San Diego proposal7

Adjournment98

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 December 11th, 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, Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Fred Lindahl, Ken Horsley, David Moty, Ann Pease, Keith Roudebush, Don Taylor, Kelly Waggoner, Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford

Members absent at the start of the meeting: John M. Garrison (arrived within 5 minutes of the start of the meeting), Richard Lesser, Daniel Laman

Also present: Allard Jansen from Kensington Partners (the developer for Kensington Commons, previously known as Kensington Terrace), representatives from Heart of Kensington (who reached a traffic-plan agreement with Kensington Commons), and approximately 8 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. Sean Harrison mentioned that there should be two action items from the Transportation Committee but that only one made it into the agenda. With unanimous consent, the second item was added to the agenda and the agenda was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING(S)

Deferred.

COMMUNITY FORUM / NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Sean Harrison mentioned that there had been a change to laws about recycling, but no one had precise information on what the change was.

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS



FORMATION OF ELECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

Don Taylor volunteered to be chair. Fred Lindahl, Sherry Hopwood, Jeanie Camp, Jan Bart volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. David Moty made a motion requesting to appoint the aforementioned to the subcommittee, with Don Taylor serving as chair. John M. Garrison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

TRANSPORTATION

ACTION ITEM: KENSINGTON COMMONS TRAFFIC PLAN

Action Item: Approve/Disapprove Transportation subcommittee recommendation by 7-1 vote to petition City to make one way the 4700 block alleys between Marlborough and Edgeware. Recommendation is for the north/south alley to be one way from north to south, the east/west alley to be one way from west to east, and add a “No Left Turn/Right Turn Only” to the alley exit onto Edgeware.

Some items that were discussed and information provided:

- Parking – clarification that the developer is not prohibited from providing more than the minimum required parking.
- Northbound ally – instead of one-way, possibly a stop sign for traffic calming at the north end?
- The traffic engineer did not study or make a formal recommendation for right-turn only on Edgeware. Don Taylor expressed concern that without a traffic engineer’s study confirming the assertions of HOK and the developer, the KTPG could not be sure the proposal would work as described, and may actually increase congestion on Marlborough as customers circle the block. David Moty read a letter from Richard Lesser, where he stated this right-turn-only seemed to be less about traffic flow and more about keeping business patrons from parking in the 4700 block of Edgeware. Later, Margaret McCann of HOK stated that a main goal for this proposal actually is to keep patrons from parking in the 4700 block of Edgeware, and cited the bollards on Terrace as an example of justification.
- Clarification on where employees will be allowed to park. Employees are to park north of Alder or south of Madison. The developer indicated the justification was to encourage short term business parking in the first block north and south of Adams Ave. (which is not part of the traffic proposal)



- Developer Impact Fees – do not necessarily have to be spent in the area where they are generated, but it is an argument that could be made.
- Many aspects of the plan, and many alternatives, have been discussed through many private meetings between HOK and the developer.
- The baseline traffic counts (a traffic count was done as part of the developer’s Mitigated Negative Declaration approximately 5 years ago)

Don Taylor – proposed an amendment to approve, removing the recommendation for a “No Left Turn/Right Turn Only”, replacing that portion of the proposal with a recommendation that the City Traffic Engineer study the impact of the “No Left Turn/Right Turn Only” on nearby north/south streets adjoining Adams Ave. in Kensington.

Ken Horsley – seconded the amendment.

A vote was called on the amendment.

- In favor: Sean Harrison, Sherry Hopwood, Ken Horsley, Ann Pease, Don Taylor
- Opposed: Frank Doft, Fred Lindahl, David Moty, Keith Roudebush, Kelly Waggoner, Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford, John M. Garrison
- The amendment failed 8-5

A vote was called on the original motion.

- In favor – Kelly Waggoner, Sherry Hopwood, Bob Coffin, Ken Horsley, Guy Hanford, Ann Pease, John M. Garrison, David Moty, Fred Lindahl, Frank Doft
- Opposed – Don Taylor, Sean Harrison, Keith Roudebush
- The motion passed 10-3

INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT ON SUBCOMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE DISCUSSIONS REGARDING KENSINGTON PARKING ISSUES IN THE AREA SURROUNDING ADAMS AVENUE

There was a report on possible cross-walks.

INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT ON DECEMBER 4TH MEETING WITH STAFF FOR TONI ATKINS, AND AN ADDITIONAL MEETING WITH COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS REGARDING EL CAJON BLVD

David Moty reported on this meeting, which was attended by himself and Sean Harrison. There was discussion on CIP requests. Advice from Toni Atkins’ staff was to map out all the requests and



watch as grants become available, then try to tailor each request to the criteria of the grant. A lot of the grants are based on things like environmental justice, which could potentially include the amount of CO₂ from idling cars, meaning traffic related issues could be applicable.

ACTION ITEM - RED CURB ON THE NE CORNER OF 42ND STREET AND ADAMS

[Secretary's note: According to the KTPG Chair, this item was inadvertently omitted from the agenda. KTPG voted at the start of the meeting to add this to the agenda by unanimous consent. For avoidance of doubt concerning propriety, even though this item came from subcommittee, it will be put forth tonight by way of a motion with a second.]

The City has already added some red curb striping on the Northeast corner of 42nd Street and Adams Avenue. The subcommittee asked to reduce that to 10 feet.

The motion was made by Sean Harrison, seconded by Don Taylor.

There was some discussion around whether red striping was needed at this intersection at all, and if so how much was needed.

A vote was called on the motion.

- In favor – Kelly Waggoner, Sherry Hopwood, Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford, Ann Pease, John M. Garrison, David Moty, Fred Lindahl, Frank Doft, Don Taylor, Sean Harrison, Keith Roudebush
- Opposed – Ken Horsley
- The motion passed 12-1

CIP

ACTION ITEM: PROJECT LIST FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN

Action item to Approve/Disapprove CIP & Planning subcommittee recommendation by 4-0 vote to submit the linked project list with the assigned priority level for the Public Facilities Financing Plan. Projects will be combined with the lists from other Mid-City Plan communities to calculate Developer Impact Fees for Mid-City.

<http://www.sandiego.gov/facilitiesfinancing/pdf/plans/draftmidcitypffpfy2014fv.pdf>

Vicky Burgess– City of San Diego – Public Facilities Financing – the proposed new fee has been increased by \$105 compared to the proposal presented at to the CIP subcommittee. Currently, fees effective today are \$2,545 per unit. The revised proposal is to increase that to \$11,922 per unit.



John M. Garrison – proposed an amendment to remove the traffic signal at Kensington and Adams from the list of priorities. There was some discussion around the pros and cons of a traffic light there. Garrison felt that a traffic light at Kensington and Adams would be too close to the one at Marlborough and Adams, and said that a traffic light isn't needed for pedestrians since they are only one block away from a traffic signal in either direction. That amendment failed from lack of a second.

Don Taylor – proposed an amendment to change the item to: “traffic signal or traffic control mechanism, such as a lighter crosswalk.” The amendment was seconded by Sherry Hopwood

A vote was called on this amendment.

- In favor: Kelly Waggoner, Sherry Hopwood, Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford, Ann Pease, Ken Horsley, David Moty, Fred Lindahl, Frank Doft, Don Taylor, Sean Harrison, Keith Roudebush
- Opposed – John M. Garrison
- These amendments passed 12-1

Vote was called on the Project List as amended, seconded by Don Taylor

- In favor: Kelly Waggoner, Sherry Hopwood, Bob Coffin, Guy Hanford, Ann Pease, Ken Horsley, David Moty, Fred Lindahl, Frank Doft, Don Taylor, Sean Harrison, Keith Roudebush
- Opposed – John M. Garrison
- The list (as amendmended) passed 12-1

INFORMATION ITEM: DISCUSSION ON THE ROLE THE KTPG SHOULD PLAY IN NEIGHBORHOOD CODE COMPLIANCE ISSUES

David Moty – Should we take on neighborhood code compliance issues at all? If so, should we do it pro-actively? Should we specify ahead of time what types of issues we would take on?

John M. Garrison – Spoke in favor of the way we are working in an ad hoc fashion, if an item is brought to our attention

Kelly Waggoner – I believe we should be open to reviewing items as they are brought to our attention

Don Taylor – In some ways I believe in “if it aint broke, don't fix it”. Trying to define things too well in advance might box us in.

Ken Horsley – It could get to the point where we are being asked to intervene between neighbors in a spat



Guy Hanford – I think what we are doing is just great. I agree with the comments from John and Don. People sometimes come to us when they don't know what else to do.

Keith Roudebush – I would say let's take the list and take the top 10 or so that we think we might have to address (based upon past history) and let people know we are here to help with those. We can always adjust the list later.

Sean Harrison – One of the reason I like living here is that there is not a set of community guidelines. I am leery of anything that could be a slippery slope to seeking approval to change your house color or something like that.

Ann Pease – There are some things that the City doesn't have anything to say about, such as the design of single family houses. So we certainly wouldn't go into places that the City themselves don't go into.

Sean Harrison – we have had some spirited discussion in the past about allowable businesses. I agree with those that say we are doing well to address it as we have been.

David Moty – I think I am hearing a consensus to continue operating the way we are operating.

INFORMATION ITEM: CIVIC SAN DIEGO PROPOSAL

David Moty read a prepared statement on his meeting with Civic San Diego. (you could either insert a link, or insert the text below, or insert a condensed version of the text below.)

Comments on Meeting with Civic San Diego:

Coverage Area:

Originally CivicSD thought they might focus their attention on the length of El Cajon Boulevard from Park to either 54th or La Mesa. However, after discussions with various stakeholders, they rethought that idea and are now focusing on a square bounded by University, Fairmount, ECB, and Euclid. On the north side of El Cajon, between Fairmount and Euclid, how far they go north on those 4400 blocks would be something to negotiate with us. What goes on to the south of the Boulevard will be something CivicSD negotiates with City Heights.

Comments:

Contrary to what has been said, there is still a role for the planning groups in a CivicSD world. Civic said that in their model, developers go to the planning groups even before they design the project. It is far easier to design our concerns into a project rather than to re-design for them at the end of the process. (*I saw many nods of assent on that point*) That's something we can take away from the whole utility box issue with the YMCA and with the way undergrounding has been handled in Talmadge.

The goal of the CivicSD model is to provide certainty for developers and lay out in the rules what is expected of them, nothing more, nothing less. To give them that certainty, CivicSD does an area wide EIR for the area in question, and helps develop a Focused Plan Amendment.



If we go the CivicSD route, the most vital issues are the quality of, and the amount of input the planning groups have into the EIR and the Focused Plan Amendment. Also important is that we, as a planning group, understand the full implications of the decisions we make. We are amateurs. We will need professional outside guidance, our own IBA so to speak, to ensure we are not leaving concerns off the table.

The truth is we do need a better community plan than the one we have now. I know Jim Varnadore has written critically of CivicSD's desire to break out of the existing community plan, but for Talmadge, for the area in question, our existing community plan is inadequate. It's backwards looking and cautious. It identifies problems but offers no solutions. Backwards looking and cautious is good for the core residential area, but not near the boulevard. We definitely need to re-think the southern Talmadge portion of the Community Plan.

Is CivicSD seeking to be our IBA for the Focused Plan Amendment? Would that be appropriate? Richard Seges of CivicSD was very helpful on the YMCA utility box issue. He understood urban communities, and was a champion for not leaving utility equipment all over the sidewalks, so I have that positive experience with CivicSD staff. But it is critical that the EIR and the Focused Plan Amendment are done thoroughly and carefully and our values are in that plan.

Concerns:

My understanding is that CivicSD supplants the role of the Planning Commission. I need to educate myself better, but in some instances CivicSD may be a partial owner or at the least a facilitator of the project as well as the decider of the project's compatibility with the adopted plan. There definitely seems to be a conflict between the two roles. We all need to understand that better. A lot seems to depend on CivicSD being honest interpreters of the Focused Plan Amendment.

CivicSD would like to come to our January meeting to make a presentation.

SUMMARY:

1. Pre-Design input by planning group is a positive aspect.
2. The CivicSD concept is to provide certainty to the developer through the plan and EIR.
3. Concern about CivicSD's potential dual function as project facilitator and decision maker. (This could be a misunderstanding)
4. Concern about the quality of the EIR and Focused Plan Amendment that provides that certainty.
5. EIR and Focused Plan need to fully address every issue. No second chances.
6. Concerned if the planning group has the competence to understand full implications of decisions and to get every issue into the EIR and Plan Amendment. We have to be careful!!!
7. The current Mid-City plan is weak in both the quality of the EIR and the enforceability of the plan.
8. Parts of Talmadge need a new plan and could benefit from this.
9. Kensington should not be a part of this. Kensington may need a new plan, but it doesn't need CivicSD.



The allotted time for the meeting having been reached, John M. Garrison made a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. David Moty seconded the motion. The motion failed, which led to the meeting being adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

David Moty adjourned the meeting at 8:30 pm