

Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee
Minutes of Zoom meeting February 10, 2021

Called to order at 6:35 pm

Board Members Present (9):

- *Kathy Vandenheuvel (GGHPC Chair, GGHPC Community Planners Committee Representative)
- *Sabrina DiMinico (Vice Chair)
- *Susan Bugbee (Elections, Membership, Historical Subcommittee Chair)
- *Victoria Curran (GGH Balboa Park Representative, Bicycle Subcommittee Chair)
- *Paul Schumacher (Projects Subcommittee Chair)
- *Reyna Ayala
- *Cheryl Brierton (taking minutes)
- *Joe Coneglio
- *Richard Santini

Absent (3):

- *Erika Espinosa Araiza (Airport Noise Advisory Committee Representative)
- *Valerie Pasquetto
- *Susanna Starcevic

Vacancies: 4

Members of the Public Present (28 participants): Roster maintained by GGHPC Membership/ Elections (Bugbee)

Government Representatives Present:

- * Ryan Darsey for San Diego City District 3 Councilmember Steve Whitburn
- *Bernie Turgeon (City of San Diego Senior Planner)

Government Representatives Absent:

- *53rd Congressional District (Rep. Sarah Jacobs)
- *39th State Senate District (Pro Tem Toni Atkins)
- *78th Assembly District (Assemblymember Chris Ward)
- *89th Assembly District (Assemblymember Lorena Gonzalez)
- *City of San Diego Mayor (Todd Gloria)
- *City of San Diego Police Department Community Relations Officer

A. Approval of Minutes

Motion

Brierton moved, DiMinico seconded, motion carried: 8-yes, 0-no, 1-abstention (Ayala, not present): to approve the meeting minutes of January 13, 2021, and the Special Meeting minutes of January 19, 2021.

B. Government Representatives

(1) Council District 3 (Darsey):

-The Councilmember is holding community forums about San Diego Gas and Electric franchise agreement 2/13 and 2/18. Contact RDarsey@SanDiego.gov for further information.

—The Mayor/City have extended eviction protections, emergency rentals, and are addressing budget shortfall.

Responses to Questions (Darsey):

—Did City Council members give input on persons selected for Mayor's Black Advisory Council? Police Oversight Advisory Board? (Measure B)? (Brierton). Response: There are a lot of Boards and Committees with vacancies, check online at City website to apply.

(2) City Planner (Turgeon)

—Is present primarily to assist with Elections-related questions. (Quarterly appearance.)

Responses to Questions (Turgeon):

—What is status of Historic District?(Brierton, Member of the Public/Past Chair Swarens) Response: Timeline slipped, property information should be released in the next couple of months.

-What is status of reconciling GGHPC Community Plan bicycle routes with Bicycle Masterplan? (Brierton, Swarens). Response: Turgeon will follow up. Vandenheuvel: bicycle meeting was set pre-pandemic, then postponed.

C. Non-agenda Public Comment: None.

D. Action Items:

1. Presentation by Parks And Recreation Coalition (PARC) (Tom Mullaney) (See Attachment 1.) The city has approved Housing and Mobility Plan Elements, Parks and Recreation are pending. There are no parks in Golden Hill.

Brierton: GH is supposed to accept Park Equivalencies in Balboa Park, yet GH has not been allowed to have Balboa Park multi-modal path through Golf Course Drive despite the East Mesa Plan, and community advocacy for over 40 years. In addition, there appears to be no coordination with City Development Services, when it reviews proposed plans, for parks identified in the GGH Community Plan of 2016. For example, the proposed park south of the 32nd Street canyon will soon be built up.

Motion

Brierton moved, Curran seconded, motion carried, Unanimous (9-0-0):

Support the improvements to the Parks Master Plan and Recreation Element recommended by PARC in addition to support for implementation of the GGHPC Community Plan, as set forth in Recreation Element. (2016 GGH Community

Plan, pages RE-142 et seq.). GGHPC to send a letter of support to the Mayor and City Council requesting that city staff work with Community Planning Groups, Recreational Advisory Groups, and PARC for input.

2. Open Board position declared by Chair: Former Secretary Michael Nazarinia resigned, moved out of GH, no longer eligible.

3. Elections (Bugbee).

—There are 11 open positions (3 are 1-year terms, rest are 2-year. Turgeon will check to see if the 11 candidates declared today can be automatically installed under pandemic rules.

Otherwise, there will be an election by drop-off ballot (or mail return) in front of the Clubhouse near the GH Recreation Center, 2600 Golf Course Drive, San Diego, CA 92102, from 3 pm to 6 pm on March 10, 2021, before the 6:30 pm GGHPC meeting. Bugbee will post exact procedures on the website.

—The 11 declared candidates gave brief statements concerning eligibility, qualifications, and interests.

*(1) Kathy Vandenneuvel, current GGHPC Chair, engineer, homeowner in GH;

*(2) Reyna Ayala, lives in GH, works as Imperial Beach City Planner, current GGHPC board member;

*(3) Cheryl Brierton, term expired, needs 2/3 vote to remain if election, South Park homeowner, attorney, volunteer small claims judge, US Citizenship tutor, EEOC employment mediator;

*(4) Sabrina DiMinico, South Park homeowner, marketing/data professional

(5) Paul Schumacher, currently on Board, Projects Subcommittee Chair, architect;

(6) Will Link, South Park homeowner, Doctorate in Physics, Biotec employment;

(7) Mónica de la Cruz, renter, person of color;

(8) Celestin Faustino, South Park resident, family from Mali;

(9) Kerry Wesson, lives in Golden Hill, works as City employee involved with Golf Course Drive redesign;

(10) Mike Gruby, retired Construction Contract estimator.

(11) Ian Koskela, (not present).

4. Project 596635.

There will be a future meeting addressing this project. The sense of GGHPC was to leave the recommendations from the 1/19/2021 Special meeting in place, so that the developer could address GGHPC concerns at the future meeting.

5. Golf Course Drive multi Modal Bicycle/Pedestrian Path. GH has been trying to get this for over 40 years, and approved a proposed project now allegedly superseded. Development subcommittee met 1/3, and proposed motions.

Motion

Schumacher moved, Brierton seconded, motion carried, unanimous, 9-yes, 0-no-Abstentions-0.

In addition to reaffirming the planning group's interest in divided, protected bike lanes as a core concept of the Golf Course Drive improvement project, the GGHPC also requests the following:

We would appreciate information, and the opportunity to provide input on:

- 1) Landscape design, including the potential for on-site mitigation for loss of trees and other vegetation/habitat as a result of this project.
- 2) Lighting Design.
- 3) Review of the possibility of placing the sidewalks on the canyon rim (north side) of golf course drive east (from the area of the clubhouse."horse-shoe" to 28th Street.. while maintaining the sidewalk connection with the rec center to 26th street in the golf course drive ccd line.
- 4) Explore the possibility of relocation of the golf course drive east portion of the project further south into the area of the greens to minimize canyon disruption and impacts associated with that.
- 5) Consider development of a canyon overlook near the right angle turn mid route (to the west of the clubhouse area) This is a great view spot, and such an amenity would enhance the project greatly.

And also would like to inquire regarding:

- 6) Design and use plans for the area enclosed by the "horse-shoe" section near the historic clubhouse. This is an area created by the new proposed alignment of the route."

5. All Subcommittee reports are continued to the 3/10/2021 GGHPC meeting, in view of the late time. Curran commented that the Balboa Park sky wheel is a no go.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm.

Next meeting is Wednesday, March 10, 2021 at 6:30 pm, following elections 3-6 pm if needed.

Attachment 1
Parks for All Presented by PARC



PARC

Parks and Recreation Coalition



Parks for All

presented by

PARC

(Parks and Recreation Coalition)

- PARC

Volunteer group includes:

- former city planners
- architects
- landscape architects/ park designers
- community planners



***“Park improvement is among the most important undertakings before the city. It should have the cordial cooperation of all.”
San Diego Union Editorial 1910***



Compare two visions

Our vision



City's vision



back

City's proposed Parks Master Plan



Stated goal: To rely primarily on getting **more use** from **existing parks**.

Projected increase in City of San Diego population,

2020-2050: **350,000**



Need more
points?
Remove trees

Look what happens when you cut down too
many trees! 😊



This one will have to last a long time!

THE GOOD: Admirable Goals

- Promotes a parks system that is relevant, accessible, iconic, sustainable and equitable
- Meets the changing needs and priorities of **current and future residents**
- Addresses long-standing **inequities** in the City's park system

Golden Hill goals, 11/3/20

1. Every neighborhood must have its park needs met.
2. No net loss of park acreage.
Actual acreage. Planned acreage.
3. Commercialization. Not wanted. Should not encourage it.
4. Access. 10 minute walk from all homes, an important goal.



Golden Hill, Park Inventory

Community	Park Requirement	Deficiency in Useable Parks	% Deficient
Torrey Hills	15	0	0 No deficiency
Sabre Springs	31	16	52%
Peninsula	103	70	68%
Uptown	104	92	88%
Golden Hill	50	50	100% No parks within community

Source: City of SD, June 2020

PARC

Parks and Recreation Coalition



Problems with the draft Parks Master Plan

- Limited vision: Little parkland for our growing city. 350,000 more city residents (2050)
- Limited resident participation after release of Draft
- Citywide Park Fee. How would money be allocated? When returned?
- Untested: Points system and park standards
- Commercialization, MSCP, Historic Resources, Design Review, Implementation issues



Limited Vision: Less parkland for our growing city



*Higher density housing, smaller-sized units and more people increases the **need** for more parkland. **More housing without more parkland** will not create a world-class parks and recreation system. Parkland is significantly devalued; policy is only “continue to pursue.”*

REQUESTS:

- Retain the **park acreage standard**
- Include minimum protections for **passive recreation** in parks
- Increase minimum % funding for **parkland acquisition**



Public Engagement



The first step in equitable park planning is to *“be in conversation with communities to get their vision for what they want parks to be, whether that’s building new parks or reimagining existing spaces.”* Room to Roam, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, October 2020

REQUEST: Consult with **Community Planning Groups** & **Recreation Advisory Groups**



Funding for parks



The Development Impact Fee (DIF) system is not a sufficient source of funding to meet the city's park needs nor can it be used for operations and maintenance.

REQUESTS:

- Build support for other significant funding sources
- Retain policy in Recreation Element to do nexus study to establish fees for non-residential uses (RE-A-2 d)
- Require Community Benefit Zoning analyses in community plan updates and upzones for parkland acquisition
- Disclose and review assumptions and rationale for 60% discount for land costs in the DIF formula
- Seek City Attorney Opinion re: dismantling FBAs

Equity



REQUESTS:

- Adequate funding overall
- Require minimum payment of DIF fees into Citywide fee fund
- Disclose assumptions for DIF estimates: will overall funding go up or down?
- Link Prioritization Framework for DIF allocation to Parks Master Plan
- Include sufficient time for public review

Complicated Points System

- Creates untested & confusing points-based system as new standard for park land and amenities
- Combined system pits land vs. amenities
- 10 sq. ft. interpretive sign has same point value as 1 acre park!

REQUESTS:

- Simplify by separating Land from Recreational Amenity points
- Clarify how point system will be used
- Separate Community Planning usage from DIF calculation usage of points
- Establish review process and refine over time



Timely Completion

- Improvements/requests can be accomplished in **reasonable timeframe**
- The problems have been identified.
The needed changes are doable.
City needs a commitment to make revisions.



What we ask of this group

Suggested MOTION:

Support the improvements to the Parks Master Plan and Recreation Element recommended by PARC.

Send a letter of support to the Mayor and City Council requesting that city staff work with Community Planning Groups, Recreational Advisory Groups, and PARC for input.



Thank you!

“A park is unlike any other asset in the city. It is not a building, not a production line, nor a warm breeze. A park is a living, growing thing that will die if the will of the people dies, or it will flourish as much as they want it to.”

San Diego Union, January 1969

Email individual questions and comments to:

planning@icontactweb.com

Thanks to contributors:

Susan Baldwin, Nico Calavita, Carolyn Chase, Julie Corrales, Howard Greenstein, Diane Kane, Debby Knight, Stacey LoMedico, Tom Mullaney, Deborah Sharpe, Rene Smith, Mike Stepner, Andy Wiese, Wally Wulfeck