**Ocean Beach Planning Board**
Meeting Minutes 150204

--Meeting start @7:05pm--

Attendees: Jane Gawronski, Mike Nieto, Dan Dennison, Drew Wilson, Peter Ruscitti, John Ambert, Andrew Waltz, Valerie Paz, Tom Gawronski, Kevin Becker

City Council District 2 Report - Conrad Wear

- Lorie recently has a "break-in" discussion at the Town Council
- Lifeguard Station is a top priority
    - Pete: Project should incudes space for a police outpost and future expansion space
- Board requested support from Lorie on Community Plan and update with the Coastal Commission

Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Frank Gormlie – OB Rag
    - Requested a biographical sketch of each board member be sent to OBragblog@gmail.com
    - Pete this could be added to the website
- Julie Quinn – Chair of peninsula Planning Board
    - Peninsula planning board is concerned about the reinterpretation of the building heights
    - Concern has resulted from construction of residential projects that appear to violate the overlay zone
    - Previously the measurement was measured form the lower of the existing or proposed grade
    - Currently parking or planters are allowing the buildings to exceed 30 ft
    - Sent a letter to the Mayor and councilperson but have not seen a response back
    - Craig Klein – How high above the limit?
        - Julie – 5 – 6' feet
    - Julie – Revised interpretations of heights were not presented to the community
    - Pete – Ambiguity of wording in Prop D and the city created an interpretation that is not clear
    - Valerie Paz– There has been good research and discussions on this. Peninsula wishes to confirm interpretations and get alliance with the OBPB
    - Dan Dennison– Criteria is unclear. In previous experience the starting measuring point from each lot would be defined at the beginning of the project
    - Board should consider developing a subcommittee to meet with Julie to bring a recommendation to the next board meeting
    - Frank – Issue of sanctions – What are the sanctions to the developer?
    - John – Building inspectors will dictate final approval on building code issues, but all local groups should built consensus around the same calculation methodology, and should create a memorandum for the city to review

**Ocean Beach Planning Board**
Meeting Minutes 150204

Action item Number 1: Elections and Nominations

- Craig Klein is submitting a valid application and signatures for appointment in district 4
    - Thoughts on being a business & property owner in OB
        - Discourages large scale development
        - Understands the need for parking in ocean beach
        - Central Newport Avenue business core needs to be maintained as a historical district
    - **Motion:** Jane moves to appoint, seconded by Valerie
        - Approved 9-0-1

Action Item Number 2 – Niagara Residences

- Applicant:
    - Demo of existing building and construction of 2 new buildings
    - 3 surface parking and 2 garage parking, meets code
    - Both buildings are less than 30' from existing grade
    - Neighbors expressed concern about the views/trees, and applicant worked to accommodate
    - Applicant undulated the building façade to mimic surrounding structures
- Public Comments
    - How many bds/parking spot?
        - Applicant: 6 bedrooms and 5 parking spots
    - Frank – What occupies the underground areas?
        - Applicant: Living areas are underground, no parking area
    - Frank – How much cubic feet of dirt will be removed?
        - Applicant: 470 cubic yards of dirt
- Board Comment
    - Valerie: What is the geological impact on the hillside for the surrounding neighbors?
        - Applicant: Soils engineer has signed off, need to monitor for artifacts while digging
    - Structural Engineer
    - John: Can you explain the historic components of the project?
        - Applicant: Searched for the life of the property and submitted this to city
            - Researched Balboa park and found some aerial photos and submitted this to the city as well
            - Was largely altered in the 70s therefore there is not a great deal of historical significant to the architectural components?
    - Tom: Did you consider the OB Precise Plan for this project
        - Applicant: Addressed comments with the articulation of the front of the building

        - Applicant: Doors and Windows have visual rhythm that relate to the interior space
        - Tom: Did not consider preservation of the 100 year old cottage
        - Applicant: Project had been altered so much that the physical building did not have historical significance
    - Craig: Is the façade essentially the same appearance of the original
        - Applicant: This is unknown
            - When Niagara Avenue was built, it may have been modified
            - There is no other documentation
    - Valerie: Jane how does the Historical Plan Review work?
    - Jane: Generally they will send out an address and a picture of the project
        - Could respond stating the project has cottage character
    - Pete: Did the city reach out to the OB Historical Society for review?
    - Jane: Unknown
    - Pete: The plan review did not have any significant issues
        - This is on the emerging list of cottages, but there wasn't enough to flag historic for plan check
    - Jane: The city does not consider the emerging cottages as historic
    - Pete: This has been identified on a list of historical cottages but this list is not deemed a document
    - John: What are the Stormwater BMPs on site?
        - Applicant: State of California does not require stormwater retention on site. This is project is not flagged as a priority project. The project meets the code guidelines for stormwater management on site

Community Comments

    - Patrick James – Extensive work with the development of the Historical society and the emerging historic district
        - More like a 'Submerging' historic district
        - Requesting applicant to not tear the cottage down
        - Asked the board to deny approval of the project
    - Kathy Blavat (via email)
        - This project is on the OB Historical Cottage list
        - Asked about historical status

Board Comments

- Valerie: John, what are the BMPs that you read in the document
    - John: No significant water retention strategies on the project, but the project meets the minimum code requirements
    - Klein: This stormwater runoff creates an impact on businesses on Bacon street
    - Applicant: 'Mirror-drain' wall system drains water French Drains around the basement that exhaust to the street
- Jane: Jane doesn't see why the existing cottage cannot be renovated or refurbished

**Ocean Beach Planning Board**
Meeting Minutes 150204

- Craig: Has experience with a friend who owned a one story craftsman, built up the second story and maintained the character of the initial structure. Would encourage to maintain the existing historical structure. Does not support the project
- Dan: Agrees with Jane and Craig.
- Pete: Good Quality project, good job of maximizing space and low profile of the building. Very large existing home to the west which blocks the view to the Ocean. There are some issues with the consistency of the community in the context of the community Plan in terms of the historic cottages. Has a hard time supporting the project because of the demo of the existing cottage. There are good projects that preserve the front street scape and put the density and bulk in the rear of the lot. Stormwater flows meet the minimum but do not align with the expectation of the community plan. Does not support the project but appreciates the work with the neighbors for resolving the issues.
- John: Would like to hear from the Condominiums consultant about the strategy and any future tentative mapping
    - Consultant: Planning on applying for a map waiver after construction is complete. The concept is that both of them are single family homes
        - All common areas, landscape, and trash enclosures will be maintained by a separate management
    - John: The project meets code and the existing building other than being old does not have great historical significance. The applicant has made the attempt to work with their neighbors about views and trees and that is respectable. It is shame to such a old building needs to be demolished, and the existing structure cannot be incorporated into the new building.
- Tom: Absolutely does not support the project. The building on site could be incorporated into the new project. Doesn't have any issues with the building the rear of the lot
- Applicant: Project is not historic and does not have architectural significance, or elements that make it unique. Used to work for the state historical architect and the state would not find this project historic
- Jane: Recommend denial of the project to this city.
    - **Motion:** Move to deny based on demolishing a classic Ocean Beach cottage
        - Tom seconds it
        - Vote: 8-2-1
        - Obtained: Andrew – Does not align with the motion as presented

Dan: Proposal to create a Urban Design Contest

- Purpose to create talking points for developing a basis for understanding the character of the community.
- Make a multi-media campaign to engage design applications
- More discussion to follow

Chair Announcements

**Ocean Beach Planning Board**
Meeting Minutes 150204

- OB Town Council: Presentation from Conrad
- OBMA: Craig to serve as a liaison
- OB Rec Council: Meeting next Week
- Historical Society: Feb 19th - Presentation of the cottages of OB
- OBCDC: Jane – received RFPs for tot lot and fitness station. Going back to bidders with questions. Working with the city on the entryway project
- OBMA: Crime Prevention – Craig: OB Security program is continuing and funds are being raised. Over the first months logged a thousand contacts. 50+ calls to the police
- Peninsula: Valerie – Next meeting is the 19th. Could set up a target to create a repot ot the project review committee
- Midway: Dan – 3 Issues: City is getting on top of leases with Sports Arena, Veteran's village will not have the homeless tent anymore, proposal for medical marijuana (Med Box) dispensary at the airport.
- SANDAG: Pete – expansion of trolley EIR has been approved, President has money allocated for expansion of trolley in his budget, TransNET ballot measure
- Mission Bay Park Committee – No report. 1st Tuesday at 6
- San Diego River Coalition – Mike will the primary liaison
- Airport Noise – Tom: Met in January, quiet home program continues on with 2 year back log. Expanded the noise contour lines and large number of new houses are eligible. New fly quiet program where they rate the airlines on three criteria: curfew, early turns, and fleet noise quality.
- Drew: Handed 15 years of books for OB Planning Board. Should they be shredded?
    - Pete: Ok to shred if it is old
- John: Will address the bicycle corrals and crosswalks at the next PRC meeting
- Valerie: How do we address general infrastructure projects?
    - Pete: check the public facilities financing plan for CIP project
    - John: Would like to work with Conrad Lories Office to create an ongoing assessment program for local infrastructure needs.

--Meeting Adjourned @ 7:40pm--

<end>