To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

Adoption of the proposal would offer the opportunity to support underserved activities - such as a skate park - and to add a bit of habitat for flora and fauna. Regarding the latter, while the lid may not be useful beyond wildlife crossing, perhaps mitigation strategies could be employed. For example, moving the Laurel Street dog park to the lid and restoring that area.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tuck Russell

Hillcrest Resident
Hello,

I spend a lot of time on foot and on a bike as I walk and ride through Hillcrest quite often. I live in a downtown high rise, but would love to live in a busier section of Hillcrest or North Park. The problem with both neighborhoods is that they're so eaten up with parking lots and speeding cars. A lid reconnecting central Hillcrest over the 163 would be a huge step in restoring this former streetcar neighborhood back into a safe, walkable community.

As it happens, my downtown friends and I walked up for a "Taste of Hillcrest" yesterday and we did almost get hit by a speeding Silverado that failed to yield at the corner of University and 8th when we had the crosswalk light and were in the middle of the crossing when he zoomed right in between us!! It's been established that surface streets experience faster speeds when they're connected to higher speed roads and highways, irrespective of posted speeds.

Please work on building hard infrastructure like the lid, wider sidewalks, raised intersections, speed tables, and soft infrastructure like narrower lanes and smart cameras to reconnect our walkable communities. Our neighborhoods need more places to gather and engage in community. A lid and less dangerous streets would be perfect for exactly that. I hope these discussions grow. Thanks for listening!

Sincerely,
Ryan Baham, MPA, PPCM
https://www.linkedin.com/in/ryan-baham-mpa-ppcm-a05a6716
**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**

I am currently deployed in Kuwait but own a home in Hillcrest. I very much support capping 163 to build a more walkable, bikable and dense city core.

Adam Harmon
760 822 4634

Sent from my iPhone
Hello, my name is Louisa Golden, a resident of San Diego for most of my 61 years and a recent e-bike commuter. I regularly travel by bike through Hillcrest on business and for social purposes. I am here to discuss the importance of revising safe, all ages and abilities bike infrastructure on West University Avenue.

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment leaves a crucial gap in the regional bikeway network on West University Avenue. With high vehicle volumes posing safety risks, especially near an elementary school, urgent action is needed. We propose extending the one-way configuration from First Avenue to Washington Street, creating space for a protected bikeway. This revision ensures safe mobility for all users and closes the gap in the complete streets network.

The current situation is the worst part of the ride from Mission Hills into Hillcrest. The plan for a protected bikeway from Dove eastward is wonderful, but that leaves a terrible gap from where cyclists travel from Washington St. West onto University Ave. I myself get on at Goldfinch. Just a few more blocks of safety would help support new riders who are now afraid to use bicycles for day to day transportation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Louisa Golden
I’m writing in support of completing the Park Blvd bus lane (no gaps) as well as bus lanes on Fourth and Fifth. If we can rely on the bus to get to our destination on time, more people will choose the bus over their car.

As we densify, we can no longer rely on cars to get us around in a timely fashion. Cars only move 2,000 people per hour per lane, while buses in bus lanes move 10,000+ people per hour.

Thanks,
Jason Vance
North Park resident and Hillcrest visitor
Dear Hillcrest planning team,
I strongly support closing the bus lane gap on Park Blvd and planning for future bus lanes on 4th and 5th avenues. Thank you for your time.

Best,
Matthew Tillyer
Please consider adding a cap on the 163 in Hillcrest to be used for additional housing park amenities.

Thanks very much,
Wesley Shackelford
Hillcrest resident
I’m a citizen of Hillcrest and would love to see the 163 capped from University through Balboa Park.
Paul Zablotny
1290 Upas
92103
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.

2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.

3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.

4. Increased accessibility and travel between North Park and Hillcrest neighborhoods.

5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kevin Farrell

Kevin Farrell
215.760.7547
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, Marston Hills, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.
6. Connecting the canyons and communities closer to what they originally were before the freeway was built.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jerry Hicks
Uptown Resident

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park's northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration,

Brian Briones

Uptown Resident
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park's northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration,

Erin Forbes

Hillcrest homeowner
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jaime Montes

Uptown Resident
Hello,

I live in Hillcrest. One of the key reasons I call Hillcrest home is the walkability of the community. An essential element to this is access to nearby green space. The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment should consider the impact the 163 has on the community and Balboa park. The noise and exhaust pollution has a significant impact on Hillcrest as a community as well as the park. Further, in an area of the city where space is at a premium, this highway dedicates a huge amount of space to cars that could prioritize people. In regards to this, please add in considerations to the plan for converting the space back into a park and doing one of the following with the highway:

1. Removal or routing to follow the 5.

2. Capping the 163 through Balboa park.

Best,

James Kidd
Hello,

Basically, freeways are whack and stinky and walking by them in Hillcrest is a bummer for my eyes and nose. Max ick achieved! In Hillcrest, we value nice green spaces where we can enjoy the open air sans exhaust, but like, we can’t fly, sooo let’s put a lid on it! Wouldn’t it be like, WOW, if you just fixed that? Def would vote for the genius who gets into it first! So, like, Don’t Cap Me, Cap the Freeway 2024, rigggght!

Here’s how: The people said, “Pick one!” And the you choose door number 1 or door number 2!

1. Removal or routing to follow the 5.

2. Capping the 163 through Balboa park.

Keep it Civic,

Gabriel A.

P.S. Gen Z don’t play! Like fr fr!
Attached are my comments on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.
Sharon Gehl
**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**

Attached are additional comments on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment and a second attachment that it cites.

Sharon Gehl
Hi Shannon – Saw your contact listed on the Planning Commission Hearing notice for this project and left you a voicemail, also trying your specific staff email for the communication below. The County would appreciate a response prior to the May 30th PC hearing.

Thank you,

Melanie Tylke, AICP (she/her/hers)
Environmental Project Manager
Phone 619.616.9326

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Department of General Services

---

**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**

Hello Plan Hillcrest Team – County DGS wanted to confirm you received our previous Comment Letter dated 11/13/2023 regarding the October Community Discussion Draft, attached for ease of reference. After reviewing the revised Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (March 2024) and DEIR, it does not appear our comments were incorporated.

We would like to understand the rationale as to why these requests were not incorporated, specifically the GIS mapping error on Figure 8-1: Parks, Recreation Facilities and Open Space which incorrectly shows County APN: 444-110-21-00 as ‘Public Open Space Parcel.’ This is a developed parcel that includes portions of MHPA canyon lands, however the entire parcel is not public open space and should not be shown as such or credited as such in the City’s Population Based Parks and Recreation Facilities calculation.
Our property remains mapped as “Public Open Space” in both the updated draft focused amendment and in the draft EIR, see images below. Our property is located under the “Hospice Point Open Space” text.

https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_153d3945e599465e961088d2cbbc3aee.pdf page 199
I am available for a call, meeting or further email communication to discuss. I had tried calling the phone number listed for Selena, however that phone number was out of order. We also request to receive hardcopy mail notifications at the address listed below, for the remainder of this project. Looking forward to hearing back from you.

Thank you,

Melanie Tylke, AICP (she/her/hers)
Environmental Project Manager
Hello Melanie,

Thank you for submitting feedback on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Discussion Draft. All feedback received will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the second draft. The second draft will be made available with further opportunities for feedback in early 2024. These comments will be considered, and the plan will be updated based on further input before it is presented to the City Council for adoption in the Summer of 2024.

The City is committed to meaningful community engagement and welcomes all productive feedback.

If you have any questions, please contact us at: PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov and keep up to date on the project by visiting PlanHillcrest website and signing up for our mailing list.

Thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Selena Sanchez Bailon
She/her/hers  |  Why do pronouns matter?
Assistant Planner
City of San Diego
Planning Department

T (619) 533-3672
sandiego.gov
SSanchezBail@sandiego.gov

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
To whom it may concern,

Please see attached comment letter from the County of San Diego, Department of General Services regarding the Hillcrest Focused Plan Update Community Discussion Draft. The County appreciates the opportunity to comment on this plan amendment and looks forward to receiving future documents related to this plan amendment and providing additional assistance, at your request.

Melanie Tylke, AICP (she/her/hers)
Environmental Project Manager
County of San Diego, Department of General Services
Phone 619.616.9326 Email melanie.tylke@sdcCounty.ca.gov
5560 Overland Ave., Suite 410, San Diego, CA 92123
Delivering our best, so you can deliver your best.
Please send me enhanced pages of Hillcrest Plan Amendment pages 26-36.
Thank you.
Carol Emerick
First, I'd like to express my support and thanks for the hard work of the planning department staff who have worked on this update. It is most definitely a large step in the right direction. Following are a few comments on the draft:

The plan still includes Class II & III bicycle facilities. Please consider adjusting the design of the streets to include Class IV, fully separated bikeways wherever possible to promote safety and ensure we are able to meet the city's VisionZero commitment.

Expand the existing dedicated transit lanes called for in the current draft, convert any peak-only transit only lanes to full-time transit only lanes.

Many streets are marked at “2-lane collectors” please include physical traffic calming measures to ensure traffic does not speed on these streets. Consider making all intersections in high or medium pedestrian areas include features such as raised crosswalks and speed humps.

Consider converting “2-lane” collector streets to have only one lane of general traffic to further enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety. Use freed up space for dedicated transit, biking, and walking facilities. While outside of the Plan Hillcrest area, the eastern end of University is a key target for this treatment.

Be bolder not just enhancing pedestrian safety in existing high walking traffic areas but create and induce demand for walking in more areas by making it safer and more pleasant in additional areas. This can include acceleration of promenades which can be enhanced by developers. Waiting for development only creates piecemeal treatments with gaps that may never be completely filled. Marking these areas out in advance with simpler approaches that can be enhanced ensures they are part of a coherent plan.

The class II bike lanes south of University on 6th Ave are dangerous and need to be revised. As cars speed off of the 163 at speeds approaching 50 mph, traffic calming and class IV bike facilities are necessary in this area.

Consider capping part of the 163 to allow adding additional retail, park and residential spaces. This could be effective at University, Robinson and at areas surrounding Balboa Park to eliminate breaks in the park generated by freeway construction.

I strongly support the conversion of Robinson and University into one way systems on the narrower end. Having just sat through 5 light cycles trying to cross 5th Avenue on Robinson due to traffic trying to turn left on 5th ave this could greatly enhance the flow of traffic. This MUST be combined with sufficient traffic calming, such as raised continental crosswalks or other traffic calming approaches to ensure it doesn't lead to higher traffic speeds.
I support the LGBTQ+ cultural district plan, including the support for promoting events over buildings. Our history needs to be celebrated in Hillcrest and in other parts of the city where LGBTQ events took place. These places, people and events are more important than buildings that may be preserved just because they are old or were the spaces that were available at the time to meet.

Branding and wayfinding around the key places and event markers celebrating LGBTQ history is key to establishing and celebrating the cultural history of Hillcrest and Uptown as a unique part of San Diego history.

The LGBTQ cultural district must be guided by a group of LGBTQ citizens, selected BY and for the community. Not just familiar faces, but the new younger faces who are taking the community forward.

So many LGBTQ youth come to large cities like San Diego to escape repression and rejection from their families. They want to settle in and around the focus of LGBTQ life in areas like Hillcrest. The current lack of affordable housing set aside to welcome and protect these youth must be addressed so that there is always a welcoming space for them in which to settle, discover themselves and build on the vibrant community here.

I agree with the concept of removing blank walls and activating new buildings with retail, public areas - including open rooftops for fresh air and views, and a distinctive neighborhood look and feel. This includes the amenities that make people want to use them; restrooms, public wi-fi, access to water and quiet seating protected from high speed traffic noise.

I'm sure we will continue to have discussions as this process moves to committee hearings with the next DRAFT, but please keep up the excellent work!

Regards,

Michael Donovan
Hillcrest
jmdonv@gmail.com
Hello, my name is Hannah and I live in the Mission Hills neighborhood. I am emailing about the importance of revising safe, all ages and abilities bike infrastructure on West University Avenue.

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment leaves a crucial gap in the regional bikeway network on West University Avenue. With high vehicle volumes posing safety risks, especially near an elementary school, urgent action is needed. **My husband and I support the one-way configuration from First Avenue to Washington Street, creating space for a protected bikeway.** This revision ensures safe mobility for all users and closes the gap in the complete streets network.

We personally bike around town for the majority of our chores, support local businesses, and to see friends all around San Diego's many neighborhoods. The University Ave bicycle infrastructure is often the most dangerous part of our route and we have personally been a part of or witnessed instances of conflict and confusion between car drivers and bicyclists due to the design. By investing protected bikeways all the way from First Ave to Washington, it would help connect many areas of businesses and transportation from the Washington trolley, International Row, Mission Hills businesses, and Hillcrest businesses.

Best,
Hannah
Dear Ms. Mulderig:

Please see the attached letter from Mission Hills Heritage with comments to the March 2024 draft of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Thank you.

Barry Hager for
Mission Hills Heritage

Barry E. Hager, Esq.
Treitler & Hager, LLP
3737 Camino del Rio South, Suite 109
San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone (619) 283-1111
Facsimile (619) 528-0746
Email: bhager@tahlaw.com
www.tahlaw.com
To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Tatjana Tomic, a concerned resident and a mother of three. I am here to discuss the importance of revising safe, all ages and abilities bike infrastructure on West University Avenue.

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment leaves a crucial gap in the regional bikeway network on West University Avenue. With high vehicle volumes posing safety risks, especially near an elementary school, urgent action is needed. We propose extending the one-way configuration from First Avenue to Washington Street, creating space for a protected bikeway. This revision ensures safe mobility for all users and closes the gap in the complete streets network.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tatjana
To whom it may concern,

I have never sent in a comment to the planning commission before, however after reading Andrew Bowen's story on KPBS and discovering that the commission is considering a freeway lid in the area, I wanted to express my support for the idea.
Hello!

As a resident of San Diego (Hillcrest for two years and now closer to City Heights), I would like to voice my recommendation for a freeway lid over the 163 freeway in Hillcrest! I currently live between the 805 fwy and Teralta Park over the 15 fwy, and it cannot be said enough how drastic a difference there is between the two for me. Walking to and spending time Teralta is an event and an activity--whereas I am trying to get across the 805 as quickly as possible so I can hear myself think! Hillcrest is in desperate need of some local greenspace, and I can't think of a better way to make it happen than putting a lid over the 163.

Thanks for your consideration,
Katherine Pittman
I remain disgusted and angry about our elected officials continuing to forge ahead with the current ill conceived plan for increasing population density in the greater Hillcrest area. There is evidence from the state and SANDAG forecasts that this plan is out of date based on their projected population studies that are most current. There is no consideration for the stress this plan would place on the water, sewage, garbage and transportation system. Indeed, there will be less park and recreation facilities available than is currently the case. Kindly listen to the citizens who live here and realize this is not a nimby issue but a fact based objection to making our city less livable.
Kathy Schneider
To Whom It May Concern:

This Hillcrest Plan is disastrous. We lack sustainable infrastructure to support the massive developments this plan calls for. We have a deficit in this regard. More sewers, water pipes, etc... digging up our streets again.

We have to be conservative with our water and energy. This is the opposite of Climate Action Plan. It’s reckless. These developments will need more air conditioners and heating. Higher density means more traffic congestion creating more pollution emissions. Higher buildings clustered together for 35,000 more people restricts air flow during increasingly hotter weather. This idea is NOT sustainable for our city. Please vote no against this Hillcrest plan.

Sincerely
Karen Ebner
Hello, I saw on Twitter some information about emailing before tonight about the development plans for Hillcrest - specifically the "163 lid". I just want to say I'm in support of it, and support on any kind of development for public spaces. We don't have any kind of public spaces in the neighborhood that are not a business and we desperately need one.

Additionally, some kind of consistent implementation of bike lanes would be really appreciated.

Thank you, Sergio C. - Been in Hillcrest for about 5 years now and I just want this neighborhood to continue growing.
No to PlanHillcrest!

This self-serving utopian dream of yours is built on an unstable foundation of fantasy and untruths. PlanHillcrest’s densification project will only make Hillcrest and surrounding areas less livable and will lead inevitably to tax increases that will hurt the people of San Diego.

Here’s a short list of problems that this plan has chosen to ignore:

- increase in density
- Lack of mobility
- public transportation
- transportation changes
- lack of infrastructure
- parking
- affordable housing,
- parks
- recreation,
- public safety

STOP PlanHillcrest!

Peggy Frye
I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

With the proposed additional density in our neighborhood, we could sure use some additional open space!

Thanks for reading this.

Dave Hepler
Good afternoon,

I am reaching out to see if someone might be available to give an overview of the Hillcrest Community Plan Amendment at our Yimby Democrats of San Diego County May general meeting. We will meet on May 22 from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm at Park & Rec at 4612 Park Blvd. Many members of our group have been active participants of the process, but we’d like our full membership to learn about the update.

Let us know if you might be available. I’m happy to answer any questions.

Thank you,

Jordan

YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County
info@yimbydemssd.com
First, I'd like to express my support and thanks for the hard work of the planning department staff who have worked on this update. It is most definitely a large step in the right direction. Following are a few comments on the draft:

The plan still includes Class II & III bicycle facilities. Please consider adjusting the design of the streets to include Class IV, fully separated bikeways wherever possible to promote safety and ensure we are able to meet the city's VisionZero commitment.

Expand the existing dedicated transit lanes called for in the current draft, convert any peak-only transit only lanes to full-time transit only lanes.

Many streets are marked at “2-lane collectors” please include physical traffic calming measures to ensure traffic does not speed on these streets. Consider making all intersections in high or medium pedestrian areas include features such as raised crosswalks and speed humps.

Consider converting “2-lane” collector streets to have only one lane of general traffic to further enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety. Use freed up space for dedicated transit, biking, and walking facilities. While outside of the Plan Hillcrest area, the eastern end of University is a key target for this treatment.

Be bolder not just enhancing pedestrian safety in existing high walking traffic areas but create and induce demand for walking in more areas by making it safer and more pleasant in additional areas. This can include acceleration of promenades which can be enhanced by developers. Waiting for development only creates piecemeal treatments with gaps that may never be completely filled. Marking these areas out in advance with simpler approaches that can be enhanced ensures they are part of a coherent plan.

The class II bike lanes south of University on 6th Ave are dangerous and need to be revised. As cars speed off of the 163 at speeds approaching 50 mph, traffic calming and class IV bike facilities are necessary in this area.

Consider capping part of the 163 to allow adding additional retail, park and residential spaces. This could be effective at University, Robinson and at areas surrounding Balboa Park to eliminate breaks in the park generated by freeway construction.

I strongly support the conversion of Robinson and University into one way systems on the narrower east end. Having just sat through 5 light cycles trying to cross 5th Avenue on Robinson due to traffic trying to turn left on 5th ave this could greatly enhance the flow of traffic. This MUST be combined with sufficient traffic calming, such as raised continental crosswalks or other traffic calming approaches to ensure it doesn't lead to higher traffic speeds.
I support the LGBTQ+ cultural district plan, including the support for promoting events over buildings. Our history needs to be celebrated in Hillcrest and in other parts of the city where LGBTQ events took place. These places, people and events are more important than buildings that may be preserved just because they are old or were the spaces that were available at the time to meet.

Branding and wayfinding around the key places and event markers celebrating LGBTQ history is key to establishing and celebrating the cultural history of Hillcrest and Uptown as a unique part of San Diego history.

The LGBTQ cultural district must be guided by a group of LGBTQ citizens, selected BY and for the community. Not just familiar faces, but the new younger faces who are taking the community forward.

So many LGBTQ youth come to large cities like San Diego to escape repression and rejection from their families. They want to settle in and around the focus of LGBTQ life in areas like Hillcrest. The current lack of affordable housing set aside to welcome and protect these youth must be addressed so that there is always a welcoming space for them in which to settle, discover themselves and build on the vibrant community here.

I agree with the concept of removing blank walls and activating new buildings with retail, public areas - including open rooftops for fresh air and views, and a distinctive neighborhood look and feel. This includes the amenities that make people want to use them; restrooms, public wi-fi, access to water and quiet seating protected from high speed traffic noise.

I'm sure we will continue to have discussions as this process moves to committee hearings with the next DRAFT, but please keep up the excellent work!

Regards,

Michael Donovan
Hillcrest
jmdonv@gmail.com
Hi All,

Please find the plan comments I sent.

Thank You,
Sharon
I am generally very pleased with the plan as outlined in the updated draft. We desperately need new housing to help ease the housing affordability crisis. The 20th Century approach to new housing - suburban sprawl - is no longer economically or environmentally sustainable in the 21st Century. I fully support back filling under-utilized space in our existing neighborhoods for new housing developments. I just hope that planners honor their commitment to provide a wide range of housing types to accommodate all income levels of renters and buyers.

I do worry that the proposed improvements to public transit may not be sufficient to accommodate the number of new residents envisioned by the plan. Every effort should be made to upgrade public transit options starting now. Ridership will never increase as long as commuters have to wait 20 minutes for a bus. I would love to see a trolley extension into the Uptown neighborhoods or perhaps an automated system such as the Vancouver Skytrain.

University Avenue through Hillcrest is in desperate need of a complete redesign. I would like to see an emphasis on the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists over the convenience of drivers. Some improvements have been made recently (no right turn on red in some intersections and walk signals timed to give pedestrians a head start) but these improvements should be implemented at EVERY intersection with high pedestrian activity. I would like to see automobile traffic limited to one lane each way on University through Hillcrest, with dedicated transit lanes and barrier protected bike lanes as well as improved pedestrian right of way. Crosswalks at intersections with high pedestrian activity along University Avenue, and mid-block cross walks, should be raised to sidewalk level. This will force drivers to slow down at those intersections and provide additional protection to pedestrians.

The draft plan mentions the need for additional green space and open space in Hillcrest and other neighborhoods but I don't think it really provides any clear suggestions as to how to accomplish this. I saw an article recently proposing that a park be constructed over SR163 as it winds through Hillcrest. A park stretching from the Richmond Street bridge to the Washington Street bridge would be an incredible addition to the neighborhood but I suspect the engineering challenges, not to mention the cost, make that proposal extremely unlikely. Perhaps a way can be found to improve access to Balboa Park from the Uptown neighborhoods. Perhaps a new local bus route that connects Mission Hills, Hillcrest, University Heights and North Park to each other and to Balboa Park would be feasible.

Thank you,
Gregory Patrick
1270 Cleveland Av #218
San Diego, CA 92103
Hello,

I HOPE you will vote NO on the Hillcrest Plan as proposed.

The wild increase in density will destroy the community. There is no plan to build parks, schools, add libraries, provide adequate water supply & pressure, provide increased sewage pipes and trash removal, decrease the auto traffic & parking problems, or save existing residential neighborhoods. Historic buildings & residences have no protection from developers.

Maple Canyon is already being desecrated at Spruce & 3rd Ave. by an out of town developer who has ignored resident neighbors and the wild creatures who lived in the canyon.

We feel ignored and disrespected as the city powers misuse our money and ask us for more. The Hillcrest Plan as proposed is more evidence that the powers who run this city are ignoring the wishes of the people who gave them power.

Sincerely,
Susan Fleming
3223 Second Avenue
San Diego, CA 92103
Sent from my iPad
Hello

Please register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest

* The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.
* The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.
* A doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.
* The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.
* The plan would be harmful to historic resources.
* The city has provided no plan to add the parks and recreation facilities which would be needed to accommodate a doubling of the housing units and residents in the Uptown community.
* Reinstate the development impact fees on all projects

Thank you.

Lisa

Lisa L. Mortensen
DRE# 00583530
SCOTT & QUINN REAL ESTATE
1111 Ft. Stockton Drive #B
San Diego, CA 92103
mortensen@sqre.com
(619) 818-5566
"Working hard to achieve results since 1976!"
Hello,

Please register my objections to Plan Hillcrest as follows:

- the massive increase in allowable density is unneeded and inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts. According to SANDAG demographics, the population for ALL of Uptown is currently 50,000 residents. An increase of 35,000 residents in Hillcrest is a 70% increase in the entire Uptown population.

- the Plan allows for TOO MUCH density and excessive heights. Hillcrest is located in the center of Uptown, this much density will paralyze Hillcrest, all of Uptown and the surrounding areas.

- there must be a viable transportation plan before any density increase, it’s unacceptable for the city to move forward without a timely, coordinated transportation plan with SANDAG

- quality of life is what it’s all about, there must be added parks and recreation facilities as well as expanded fire stations, libraries and grocery stores...

- it is essential that DIFs are reinstated on all development projects!

Regards,

Julianne Hyde
845 Fort Stockton Drive
San Diego, CA 92103
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest.

- The massive increases in allowable density is an unnecessary overreach and is inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts - particularly in light of the realized and continued forecast of population decline within the City of San Diego (and County & State).

- The plan is overly broad and aggressive, with egregious density allowance, particularly in light of recently built, current construction projects and slated pipeline of already approved projects. There are plentiful other locations along rail lines and more efficient transportation corridors to spread development.

- I am very concerned about the city’s lack of infrastructure planning and safety. Already the water and sewer infrastructure cannot handle the existing commitment and burden. It is irresponsible to rubber stamp approvals without proper due diligence. The city is cavalier about the consequences facing its taxpayers and citizens. My water pressure has already been affected.

- With approving projects without proper parking - as has been occurring, the city is catering to developers while the local residents bear the brunt of not being able to park in their neighborhoods.

- Developing multi-family in the name of low income affordable housing is a joke when to qualify for a unit, the income level is 120% of AMI - with minimal set asides for these few units. Where is the transparency here?

Thank you.

Kind Regards,
Kerri Gutekunst

Sent from my iPhone
Dear City Planning Department,

I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed Plan Hillcrest. As a resident and member of this community, I believe the changes outlined in the plan could have detrimental impacts on our neighborhood's character, environment, and overall quality of life.

Firstly, the significant increases in allowable density proposed by the plan are alarming. These increases seem unnecessary and inconsistent with the forecasts provided by the State and SANDAG, which do not justify such aggressive growth. The plan’s push for much higher densities could lead to a fundamental transformation of our community that many of us do not support.

Additionally, the scope of the plan appears overly ambitious, proposing excessive building heights and density that are out of character with the existing urban landscape of Hillcrest. Such drastic changes threaten to erode the unique charm and appeal of our neighborhood, replacing it with an impersonal and overcrowded environment.

Most concerning is the potential doubling of the population in Uptown, as outlined in the plan. This increase could lead to serious traffic congestion, making our streets far less navigable and safe. Moreover, the inevitable rise in vehicular traffic is likely to exacerbate air pollution levels, posing health risks to residents and degrading the quality of our local environment.

I urge the City Planning Department to reconsider the scale and impact of Plan Hillcrest. It is crucial that any development plans align with the community’s needs and existing infrastructure capabilities while preserving the character and livability of our neighborhood. I, along with many other concerned citizens, request a revision of the plan that considers these critical issues.

Thank you for considering our views. I look forward to your response and hope to see adjustments that reflect the community’s concerns and aspirations.

Sincerely,

Brent Gutekunst

San Diego Resident
Hello,

I would like to voice my support for RideSD's recommendations for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment in regards to public transit. I think closing the gap on Park Blvd for the bus only lane and planning future bus routes on 4th and 5th ave will truly help the neighborhood as its density increases. I use the bus multiple times a week. I live and work in Hillcrest so this plan is of utmost importance to me. Please do whatever you can to improve the public transit in our area.

Thanks for your time.

--

Sincerely,

Mario Simon
Hello and thank you for your work.

The plan still includes Class II & III bicycle facilities. Please update and improve this proposal by adjusting the design of the streets to include Class IV, fully separated bikeways.

Thank you

Harry Bubbins
Hello

Please register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest

* The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.
* The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.
* A doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.
* The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.
* The plan would be harmful to historic resources.
* The city has provided no plan to add the parks and recreation facilities which would be needed to accommodate a doubling of the housing units and residents in the Uptown community.
* Reinstate the development impact fees on all projects

Thank you.

Jim Walsh

JAMES R. WALSH
220 W. SPRUCE ST.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103-5526

Mobile: +1 619-571-6035
E-mail: jwalsh@othca.com
Dear City Planning Department,

My name is Alex and I am a renter living in Hillcrest. I attended the Vibrant Uptown Town Hall on the amended Plan Hillcrest and was very excited to see and share in the community’s enthusiasm for the future of this amazing neighborhood. I am so glad to see much needed improvements to the zoning in the area, as well as vital transportation accommodations like bus lanes and bike lanes.

The transit priority lanes planned for Hillcrest and Mission Hills will be one of the most important and biggest improvements to the bus system yet for Uptown. I regularly take the 10 bus to Old Town for my commute to Torrey Pines. By far the longest segment of that commute is the Uptown segment, which can take up to 35 min with evening traffic. Adding and extending transit priority lanes will be absolutely necessary as an incentive to get commuters to take alternative transportation modes to work, especially with the planned density increases to the area. I do however believe that transit priority lanes should exist on 4th and 5th Avenues in order to speed up one of the slowest parts of the route through the heart Hillcrest. I would like to see other bus lane gaps filled throughout the area as well, including those on Park Blvd.

The planned bicycle infrastructure improvements are great as well. I am enormously excited for more Class IV bike lanes and am itching to attend the Farmers Market on the new Normal St Promenade. But the planned bicycle facilities also pass over a major problem area: West University Avenue through Mission Hills. I truly believe bike lanes are needed on this stretch, as I am often passed aggressively while riding through here. Barring bike lanes, other infrastructure must be placed to make it clear that micro mobility should take PRIORITY over automobiles in this section. The end goal should be a safe and efficient bicycle route from Uptown directly to Washing St Trolley Station, connecting Uptown to our world class Trolley system and the rest of the region.

Within Uptown I would love to see other improvements to the pedestrian experience. Ideally this would mean regular if not permanent closure of 163 through Balboa Park, returning the space to the Park it so noisily bisects. Alternatively a Cap over the 163 would add much needed pedestrian space over the Robinson and University overpasses.

Overall, the Plan shows that we as a city know how to build a modern, multimodal, vibrant, and healthy neighborhood. I appreciate all the work that has gone into it, and cannot wait to see it come to life!

Thank you,
Alex Graff
Plan Hillcrest Comments

According to an analysis recently published by Climate Central, a nonprofit research group, about 41 million people in the U.S. live in urban heat islands, where city topography elevates temperatures by at least eight degrees Fahrenheit.

Urban heat islands occur when cities replace land cover including parks, trees, and live landscaping with buildings, pavement and other materials that absorb and retain heat. While the heat effect is most noticeable during summertime, urban heat islands are warmer all year-round.

Climate Central researchers found that San Diego housed at least one million people currently affected by the urban heat island effect.

Experts studying urban heat islands say the issue has important implications for both health and equity. Higher temperatures for people living in urban areas means a greater risk of exacerbating medical conditions and even heat-related deaths, said Jeffrey Schlegelmilch, the director of the National Center for Disaster Preparedness at Columbia Climate School.

Additionally, the following concerns me and my neighbors who includes architects and developers who live in the Uptown community:

- No focus on parks and green space that will help immensely with Urban heat pocket
- The State Auditor has stated that the proposed housing crisis is inaccurate, badly inflated
- The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.
- The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.
- Doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.
- The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.
- The plan lacks significant concern for historic resources, which is what attracts tourists and guests to San Diego. They seek to enjoy the character of San Diego that is being significantly dismantled.
- Need to reinstate the development impact fees on all projects

I encourage you to seriously consider the points made above that could forever change, and not in a good way, the personality of Uptown that has been seen as an urban jewel.
There is no reason to be so dramatic with this plan that will over build out Uptown and forever alter the health, attractiveness, character and personality of this area.

Kindly,

Patty Ducey-Brooks
Uptown Resident and Business Owner
Dear Plan Hillcrest Staff,

Please see my input on Plan Hillcrest's Second Draft below. My main concern is the lack of any increase to affordable housing requirements in exchange for density and height allowances. Our Regional Housing Needs Assessment has shown that we meet and exceed market rate/luxury housing every cycle while we fall short on affordable housing for very low income, low income, and moderate income households.

My other main concern and the focus of this letter is the confusing nature of including two definitions for "Very High" -- there should be clear categories for each type of height to avoid confusion throughout this document.

PAGE IN-6
The neighborhood includes a variety of multifamily residential and high-density mixed-use buildings.
Note: This is correct, except that the neighborhood also includes single-family homes. Change to: The neighborhood includes a variety of single-family and multifamily residential buildings and high-density mixed-use buildings.

PAGE: IN-14
If Plan Hillcrest builds on priority areas of the City of San Diego's Strategic Plan, why are the General Plan Guiding Principles removed?

PAGE: LU-25
Adding "very high" here is confusing because the document is describing the current state, but later on we define "very high" to include building heights and densities for a future state.

PAGE: LU-29, LU-31, LU-34, LU-37,
These maps show two "Residential - Very High" categories with different Du/Ac. This is confusing because earlier and throughout this document and throughout the City's planning documents, "very high' is used to describe the current state. There should be a clear differentiation with the "old" very high and "new" very high. Suggestions: "Extremely High" or "Tower High."

PAGE: LU-38
Two "Residential Very High" categories with different meanings - very confusing.

PAGE: LU-40
Remove "medium" since housing can be up to an "Extremely High" (Or "Tower High) density.
Provides for shopping areas with retail, service, civic, and office uses for the community at-large within three to six miles. Housing may be allowed up to a medium to very high density as part of a mixed-use development.

FINAL INPUT:
The City is concentrating density in the Hillcrest neighborhood, and while currently we have many luxury and market-rate housing units projected to be built in this neighborhood, we still lack in affordable housing -- even for folks making a median income in San Diego. Can this plan be used to increase the affordable housing stock, to make actual progress on our RHNA goals, in exchange for the height and density allowances being provided to developers?

In the 2005-2013 cycle, San Diego’s RHNA goal was 18,000+ Market Rate Units of housing and 27,000+ affordable units for moderate income, low income, and very low income households. In that time period, San Diego approved 22,500 Market Rate Units and only 4,300 affordable units. 84% of the total units approved were Market Rate Units.

In the last cycle (2013-2020), San Diego’s RHNA goal was 33,900+ Market Rate Units and 54,000+ affordable units. In that time period, San Diego approved 37,700 Market Rate Units and 6,700 affordable units. 85% of the total units approved were Market Rate Units.

The current cycle (2021-2029) calls for 108,000+ units, with a projected need for 43,800+ Market Rate Units and 64,000+ affordable units. From 2021-2023, San Diego has already approved 20,675 market rate units and 4,800 affordable units. 81% of the total units approved are Market Rate Units.

Every cycle assesses that affordable housing comprises 60% of the units needed in the region, yet we continue to prioritize and incentivize market rate and luxury housing -- this will continue to cause gentrification and displacement of our LGBTQ+ community, particularly renters, people of color, artists, service workers, and low income people and families. This directly contradicts the idea that Plan Hillcrest focuses on creating homes for all of us. We can change that by requiring additional affordable housing percentages for buildings that take advantage of the density and height allowances.

Gus Hernandez
Resident, Hillcrest
Founder, Affordable Hillcrest
affordablehillcrest.org
Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest and greatest Plan Hillcrest draft. I appreciate all the work that City staff has conducted to complete this plan. As a Hillcrest resident and member of the LGBTQ community, the future of Hillcrest is very important to me.

Here are my comments on the latest draft:

- Complete the Park Boulevard bus lane Gap. Park Boulevard contains dedicated transit lanes for much of its length. However, there is a crucial gap between Upas Street and University Avenue. This gap can cause the bus lane network from Balboa Park to El Cajon Boulevard to fail when we need it the most (e.g., December Nights).
- Plan future dedicated bus lanes on 4th and 5th Ave
- Plan future dedicated bus lanes on Washington Ave to connect Hillcrest and the trolley station. I've been stuck on a packed MTS 10 bus too many times because of single-occupancy cars.
- Upgrade Class II and III bike lanes to Class IV and I to increase safety
- Convert peak-only transit lanes to full-time transit lanes
- I support increases in affordable housing and new housing projects
- Reduce reliance on cars through road diets which will decrease the City's overall cost to maintain these streets
- I support the proposed LGBTQ district. It is important to protect people, events, and businesses instead of worrying about the physical structures.

Thank you!
Matt Stewart
Hello, my name is Keala, and I am a concerned resident of Hillcrest.

I would like to request a revision to Plan Hillcrest to include safe, all ages and abilities bike infrastructure on West University Avenue.

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment leaves a crucial gap in the regional bikeway network on West University Avenue. With high vehicle volumes posing safety risks, especially near an elementary school, urgent action is needed. We propose extending the one-way configuration from First Avenue to Washington Street, creating space for a protected bikeway. This revision ensures safe mobility for all users and closes the gap in the complete streets network.

Additionally, keeping in mind transit needs I would like to request the completion of the Park Boulevard Gap. Park Boulevard contains dedicated transit lanes for much of its length. However, there is a crucial gap between Upas Street and University Avenue. This gap can cause the bus lane network from Balboa Park to El Cajon Boulevard to fail when we need it the most (e.g., December Nights).

Lastly please plan Future Bus Lanes on 4th and 5th Avenues: The new plan proposes significantly more density in Hillcrest. When combined with the densifying Bankers Hill, and the existing dense Downtown, residents will need an efficient transit option between the three neighborhoods. RideSD recommends that the City plan for a future in which 4th and 5th Avenues have dedicated transit lanes so that residents have that option.

Many thanks for your time and consideration,

Keala Rusher
Hi All,

Please find our letter attached with comments from Vibrant Uptown.

Thank You,
Jon
Hello

Please register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest:

* The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.
* The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.
* A doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.
* The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.
* The plan would be harmful to historic resources.
* The city has provided no plan to add the parks and recreation facilities which would be needed to accommodate a doubling of the housing units and residents in the Uptown community.
* Reinstate the development impact fees on all projects

Please involve the community in a MEANINGFUL way in your plans for the Uptown area.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Brown
District 3
City of San Diego
**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**

Hello

Please register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest

* The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.
* The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.
* A doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.
* The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.
* The plan would be harmful to historic resources.
* The city has provided no plan to add the parks and recreation facilities which would be needed to accommodate a doubling of the housing units and residents in the Uptown community.
* Reinstate the development impact fees on all projects

Thank you.

Paula and Don Heye
434 West Thorn Street
SD 92103

619 917-8957
Hello,

Please register my objections to the Plan Hillcrest

* The massive increases in allowable density are unneeded and are inconsistent with State and SANDAG forecasts.

* The plan is overly broad, with too much density, and excessive heights.

* A doubling of the population of Uptown will cause serious traffic congestion and is likely to increase air pollution.

* The plan lacks provisions to reduce noise impacts between residential and commercial uses, while adding large areas with mixed-use zoning.

* The plan would be harmful to historic resources.

* The city has provided no plan to add the parks and recreation facilities which would be needed to accommodate a doubling of the housing units and residents in the Uptown community.

* Reinstate the development impact fees on all projects.

Thank you,

Cindy Yurkovich

Bankers Hill resident
From: Gail Friedt
To: PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please consider adding a lid over 163 to the plan
Date: Monday, April 29, 2024 7:22:45 AM
Attachments: EXTERNAL Please consider adding a lid over 163 to the plan.msg

**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**
Hello…

I loved the article by Andrew Bowen. Please consider adding a lid over the 163 to the current plan.

Thank you

Gail Friedt
Tait Galloway, deputy city planning director:

As you know, the City of San Diego’s Downtown Community Plan has included construction of freeway lids over several blocks of the I-5 Freeway that currently divides downtown from Bankers Hill since that plan was updated in 1989. The purpose of those lids is to reconnection downtown to the neighborhoods of Bankers Hill and Hillcrest. It would allow downtown residents to walk through freeway lid parks up to Balboa Park without needing a car, reducing VMTs and carbon emissions.

Now, I’ve read that a major Hillcrest business association has asked that, as a key element of the city’s current Plan Hillcrest upzone and update effort, the city include construction of a new lid and public park over the State Route (SR) 163 freeway as it runs through Hillcrest.

Hillcrest, hungry for park space, looks to the 163 freeway | KPBS Public Media

I agree that the city should explore this idea, and include the concept in the community plan update effort.
The city needs to find out what it would cost to build new freeway lids with parks over both I-5 and the SR 163 freeways, then work with CalTrans and the state to obtain new federal funds available under the Federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Act. This federal law includes billions of dollars for the construction of new freeway lids to reconnect communities split in two by federal and state freeways. San Diego should make a strong effort to obtain its fair share of these funds to build its own freeway parks over I-5 and SR 163.

Don Wood
619-463-9035

Dwood8@cox.net
My name is Case Sandberg, and I am a resident deeply invested in the ongoing development and sustainability of our neighborhood.

University Avenue serves as a vital corridor in Hillcrest, yet the 163 divides the neighborhood into what feels like two separate areas: 'downtown' Hillcrest and 'east' Hillcrest. This division impacts the walkability and safety of the neighborhood.

My proposal is to cap both ends of University Avenue to create continuous pedestrian zones and introduce ground-floor retail spaces along these caps. This change would transform the avenue into a vibrant, walkable boulevard, bridging the gap between the two parts of Hillcrest. It should feel like just another block along University Ave. By doing so, we could enhance the pedestrian experience, increase foot traffic, and stimulate economic opportunities with additional retail spaces that attract both locals and visitors.

This proposal aligns with our city's goals of promoting sustainable urban development and creating more walkable, connected neighborhoods. Implementing such changes on University Avenue could serve as a model for similar transformations throughout the city, furthering our commitment to enhancing urban life.
Hello Plan Hillcrest Team – County DGS wanted to confirm you received our previous Comment Letter dated 11/13/2023 regarding the October Community Discussion Draft, attached for ease of reference. After reviewing the revised Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (March 2024) and DEIR, it does not appear our comments were incorporated.

We would like to understand the rationale as to why these requests were not incorporated, specifically the GIS mapping error on Figure 8-1: Parks, Recreation Facilities and Open Space which incorrectly shows County APN: 444-110-21-00 as ‘Public Open Space Parcel.’ This is a developed parcel that includes portions of MHPA canyon lands, however the entire parcel is not public open space and should not be shown as such or credited as such in the City’s Population Based Parks and Recreation Facilities calculation.

Our property remains mapped as “Public Open Space” in both the updated draft focused amendment and in the draft EIR, see images below. Our property is located under the “Hospice Point Open Space” text.
I am available for a call, meeting or further email communication to discuss. I had tried calling the phone number listed for Selena, however that phone number was out of order. We also request to receive hardcopy mail notifications at the address listed below, for the remainder of this project. Looking forward to hearing back from you.

Thank you,

Melanie Tylke, AICP (she/her/hers)
Environmental Project Manager
From: Sanchez Bailon, Selena <SSanchezBail@sandiego.gov> On Behalf Of PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 2:57 PM
To: Tylke, Melanie <Melanie.Tylke@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Cc: Hoff, Carrie <Carrie.Hoff@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Shorb, Elyce <Elyce.Shorb@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: COSD Comment Letter - Hillcrest Focused Plan Update Community Discussion Draft

Hello Melanie,

Thank you for submitting feedback on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Discussion Draft. All feedback received will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the second draft. The second draft will be made available with further opportunities for feedback in early 2024. These comments will be considered, and the plan will be updated based on further input before it is presented to the City Council for adoption in the Summer of 2024.

The City is committed to meaningful community engagement and welcomes all productive feedback.

If you have any questions, please contact us at: PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov and keep up to date on the project by visiting Plan Hillcrest website and signing up for our mailing list.

Thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Selena Sanchez Bailon
She/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Assistant Planner
City of San Diego
Planning Department

T (619) 533-3672
sandiego.gov
SSanchezBail@sandiego.gov

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
From: Tylke, Melanie <Melanie.Tylke@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 1:21 PM
To: PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment <planhillcrest@sandiego.gov>
Cc: Hoff, Carrie <Carrie.Hoff@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Shorb, Elyce <Elyce.Shorb@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] COSD Comment Letter - Hillcrest Focused Plan Update Community Discussion Draft

**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**

To whom it may concern,

Please see attached comment letter from the County of San Diego, Department of General Services regarding the Hillcrest Focused Plan Update Community Discussion Draft. The County appreciates the opportunity to comment on this plan amendment and looks forward to receiving future documents related to this plan amendment and providing additional assistance, at your request.

Melanie Tylke, AICP (she/her/hers)
Environmental Project Manager
County of San Diego, Department of General Services
Phone 619.616.9326  Email melanie.tylke@sdcounty.ca.gov
5560 Overland Ave., Suite 410, San Diego, CA 92123
Delivering our best, so you can deliver your best.
Hello

I unfortunately do not have the capability to provide enhanced or enlarged documents. Hopefully the Planning Department staff will get this to you.

---

Jim Walsh
Chair, Uptown Planners
619-630-9610

On Mon, May 6, 2024 at 8:24 AM carol cottagevacation.us <carol@cottagevacation.us> wrote:

Please send me enhanced pages of Hillcrest Plan Amendment pages 26-36.
Thank you.
Carol Emerick

From: carol cottagevacation.us <carol@cottagevacation.us>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 8:17 AM
To: SLMulderig@sandiego.gov <SLMulderig@sandiego.gov>; chairman@uptownplannerssd.org <chairman@uptownplannerssd.org>
Subject: Hillcrest Plan Amendment May 7, 2024

Dear Ms. Mulderig,

Please send me enhanced or easy to read copies of pages 26-36.
I find the designations of proposed activities on streets very difficult to read as I am now legally blind.
Thank you.
Carol Emerick
Thank you, thank you, thank you, Shannon  !!!
Carol

Hi Carol,

Here are those pages extracted from the larger document. I hope they are easier to navigate. You may need to zoom into the maps to see the details. If there is a certain area of the map you would like me to send you a zoomed-in version, we can do that as well.

Thank you,

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)
she/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Senior Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
Dear Ms. Mulderig,

Please send me enhanced or easy to read copies of pages 26-36. I find the designations of proposed activities on streets very difficult to read as I am now legally blind.

Thank you.

Carol Emerick
Hello,

All feedback received on the Draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will then go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.

As always, thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Best,

Aparna Padmakumar
Associate Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department
apadmakumar@sandiego.gov
I am writing this email to express my support for covering parts of the 163 freeway through Hillcrest from Washington Street to Brookes Avenue (connecting to Balboa Park’s northern boundary). I am asking that the San Diego City Planning Department consider the benefits of installing a freeway lid in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that is expected to go before the City Council this summer. Benefits of installing a freeway lid include:

1. Adding more than 5 acres of green space/City Park in Hillcrest.
2. Increased pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park from the Uptown communities of Hillcrest, University Heights, and Mission Hills.
3. Traffic noise abatement through the residential communities that border the 163.
4. Elimination of homeless encampments within freeway right-of-way.
5. Safe freeway crossing for wildlife.

With the proposed additional density in our neighborhood, we could sure use some additional open space!

Thanks for reading this.

Dave Hepler
Good evening,

I wanted to follow up and see if we would be able to receive a presentation on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. We can accommodate a 10-15 minute presentation and 10 minutes for q & a. We can adjust the format based on preference. The group is supportive.

Thank you,

Jordan

YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County
info@yimbydemssd.com

On Fri, May 3, 2024 at 12:07 PM YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County <info@yimbydemssd.com> wrote:

Good afternoon,

I am reaching out to see if someone might be available to give an overview of the Hillcrest Community Plan Amendment at our Yimby Democrats of San Diego County May general meeting. We will meet on May 22 from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm at Park & Rec at 4612 Park Blvd. Many members of our group have been active participants of the process, but we’d like our full membership to learn about the update.

Let us know if you might be available. I’m happy to answer any questions.

Thank you,

Jordan

YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County
info@yimbydemssd.com
Very well said.

On Mon, Apr 29, 2024 at 6:41 PM SUSAN FLEMING <slfleming@cox.net> wrote:

Hello,

I HOPE you will vote NO on the Hillcrest Plan as proposed.

The wild increase in density will destroy the community. There is no plan to build parks, schools, add libraries, provide adequate water supply & pressure, provide increased sewage pipes and trash removal, decrease the auto traffic & parking problems, or save existing residential neighborhoods. Historic buildings & residences have no protection from developers.

Maple Canyon is already being desecrated at Spruce & 3rd Ave. by an out of town developer who has ignored resident neighbors and the wild creatures who lived in the canyon.

We feel ignored and disrespected as the city powers misuse our money and ask us for more. The Hillcrest Plan as proposed is more evidence that the powers who run this city are ignoring the wishes of the people who gave them power.

Sincerely,
Susan Fleming
3223 Second Avenue
San Diego, CA 92103
Sent from my iPad
This is fantastic....bravo all and especially Jon!

On Mon, Apr 29, 2024 at 4:37 PM Vibrant Uptown <vibrantuptown@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi All,

Please find our letter attached with comments from Vibrant Uptown.

Thank You,
Jon
Hello,

I would like to give my support for freeway lids over the 163 as part of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

As a native San Diegan and cyclist/transit-commuter currently working in 92101 and living in 92105, I think at least the possibility of freeway lids is incredibly exciting! I love to see the city at least considering different approaches, thank you.

Regards,

Reese Herrera
Dear City of San Diego Staff Members,

I have been a long time resident of Uptown since 1981 and have served on many planning positions and City of San Diego appointed boards. I am a property owner that currently lives on the dividing line between Hillcrest and Upas Street at 3404 Front Street. I am also a retired business owner (with limited roles now) at KTUA and part of a group of 8 investors, all previously associated with KTUA Planning and Landscape Architecture, of which all 8 of us are now retired but own the building at 3910-3916 Normal Street.

I am involved with the Bankers Hill Community Group and its Project Review Committee and have recently been appointed to the Uptown Planners and a member of San Diego Commons and the Maple Canyon Technical Support Group. I have been involved for many years with the Balboa Park Committee, the Mission Hills Business Improvement District and the Hillcrest Business Association. I was also responsible for the pro-bono efforts toward improvements to Normal Street including the signalization of Normal and University, the parking and medians on Normal Street and the “Above Normal” concept plans and outreach efforts that have morphed into the Normal Street Promenade. I was on the consultant team as a prime for the North Park Community Plan Update as part of the larger Uptown Hub of three community plan updates and advised on parts of the Uptown Plan itself. I was the lead on the planning level efforts for the SDSU to downtown BRT (Rapid) and the Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan as well as initial concepts for a Reynard Way Park and Complete Street Improvements. My comments attached are provided by me as a private property owner, business property owner and resident in Bankers Hill. Some of these comments may appear in subsequent input from Uptown Planners or Vibrant Uptown.

I have attached the pages where I have provided comments, some broader and some very detailed that affect the language of the document or the request of other items to be considered. I have provided a broad overview summary of the parts that are considered to be the most important by me, but a review of the attachment is also necessary.

In general, the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment is a good planning document that is consistent with many other City documents and consistent with many in the community that wish to see growth and re-investment in the community. I am one that supports any of the variations of the following terms: complete communities, 15- minute neighborhoods, complete streets, smart and efficient infill development, transit supportive design, transit oriented
development, sustainable planning, positive urban design, robust public input, integration of public art, insistence on proper design and planning, objective design guidelines, active transportation, integrated mobility technologies, and historic preservation or adaptive reuse. Most of my 45 year career as a Professional AICP planner, Certified Transportation Planner, Professional Landscape Architect and urban designer has been focussed on these topics. The vast majority of what I have found in the document meets with my approval and I praise the City for its effort in helping to encourage appropriate growth in Uptown.

The following sections have been attached and below I have provided the major issues I have concerns over in the March 2024 plan. Uptown Community Plan, Hillcrest Focus Amendment

3) Mobility
3.1 Missing important Balboa Park / West Mesa Master Plan mobility improvements including a pedestrian and bike bridge, and a multi-use path on the West Mesa that are in the Balboa Park Master Plan that should be included for context and connections that might affect plans in the adjacent area (MO-59 and MO 66).

3.2 Traffic roundabouts have been proposed on 6th Avenue and should be included on the map or text (MO-60).

3.3 Question the recommendations for one-way streets that appear to be proposed in order to improve the bridge crossings at University and Robinson that have limited width and a lack of support from Caltrans for changes. Should consider a partial or full SR-163 lid where public uses could exist on the Caltrans airspace and adjacent low density development could be up-zoned for more mixed use infill development and thereby eliminating the need to create one-way streets, providing much needed park and public space, and providing locations for clean energy production with small wind turbines and solar panels consistent with draft SB 49 guidelines for the use of Caltrans ROW for clean energy production, while preserving the Robinson Bridge historic character and to a lesser extent, the University Avenue bridge historic context as well (MO-77, MO-78).

5 LGBQT+ Culture
5.1 What is the logic for putting the entire Hillcrest Focus Plan area under the LGBQT+ cultural district when a large percent of the area has no cultural, historic or LGBQT+ specific resources and includes substantial areas of single family housing? (LC-137)

5.2 Suggest that all occurrences of People, Culture, and Buildings be changed to People, Culture and Places since it is much more important to limit these resources to significant cultural and LGBQT+ resources rather than just being buildings. This may add an additional layer on review for buildings that are already taken through the historic review process or bring in many more building for review just for being a building in the Cultural Area. (LC-139, LC 143, LC-145)

8. Recreation
8.1 Due to the increased development in Hillcrest focus area, the increases in units from the complete communities (past, current and future) and the large increase in population that Uptown is expected to absorb, the associated park developer impact fees should be substantially spent within a 2 mile-radius of projects with either park land dedication, construction of new park facilities or infill park amenity development. Not dedicating these impact fees that are generated on the basis of local park deficiencies and guided by the State of
California Quimby Act. (RE-175, RE-186)

8.2 In addition to general recreational amenities that provide for park qualitative points, a specific standard for recreation centers (typically 17,000 square feet in size) should be made clear as well as those for an aquatic facility. (RE-185)

8.3 A substantial number of park opportunities were removed from the plan, even though that even with the full implementation of these opportunities, the Uptown area would still be severely deficient in the qualitative park point system. Having an opportunity listed in this plan does not obligate the park from being developed, it only keeps the door open for additional opportunities that could be analyzed and negotiated for projects that may occur on or near these sites. (RE-176 and RE-182, RE-183, RE-184 and RE-185)

8.4 Add a partial of full bridge deck for a public plaza over SR-163. This can solve other mobility and cultural district improvements as well. (RE-189)

8.4 West Mesa Balboa Park can be considered and the Park Master Plan recommends infill amenities to increase the qualitative value of points for this part of the park for Uptown use, should be fully considered and not limited to what is in the Balboa Park Master Plan (1989) which has never shown much at all on the West Mesa, certainly no where near the facilities that could be accommodated in this part of Balboa Park without negatively affecting the rest of the park or the character of this part of the park. I understand that an amendment would be required for the Park Master Plan or a supplemental Precise Plan or General Development Plan would be required with public input. However, the community should not be limited to considering opportunities that were in the existing Parks Master Plan that forbid local and community recreational use of the park. (RE-186, RE-191 and RE-193)

11- Historic Preservation

11.1 This effort put nonprofessional input on the same level as professional input that were added by the public and not originated by the professional consultant team. This merging of categories has placed a lot of properties on the list that are not likely significant. Maybe state, that "these identified resources did not include a deeper professional review, but were identified the general public at meetings that could be considered for further review". (HP-232)

11.2 The text describes supplemental regulations related to the Focus Hillcrest Plan. Are there other interim regulations that are being proposed? If in this plan, the sentence should state. "these supplemental development regulations are included in this document". (HP-233)

11-3 This section has already been done. Should this not mention "Review and where appropriate, interject the Citywide Historic Context for LGBTQ+, into future project reviews for those projects that fit the historic periods of significance"? (HP-234)

11-4 Other benefits that can be offered to a property owner under the authority of the Mills Act could include partial re-use, partial preservation of key elements such as facade protection or partial adaptive reuse or density bonus credits or transfers. The benefits to commercial property owners is not nearly enough to offset the loss of development potential. This should be done as part of a ministerial review process instead of forcing projects with historic resources through a lengthy and costly discretionary process. (HP-234)
11-5 Consider mitigations associated with partial historic demolition along with partial adaptive re-use or protection that is possible through a ministerial review process instead of a lengthy and costly discretionary review process. Developers avoid discretionary processes and if a project becomes designated, developers will not pursue. This could also be done if a property owner does not want to accept a historic designation but agrees to supplemental development agreements, partial preservation, educational and interpretive improvements and other public and historic benefits associated with the ministerial project. (HP-235)

12- Implementation

12-1 Object to the removal of commitment to utilize collected impact fees that must be used in the community to offset the impact of development to the local community where the impact occurs. What is the reason behind this change. The complete communities program has assured the community the use of funding for correcting impacts associated with developer impact fees for infrastructure and park shortages. Removing development impact fees created a reversal of this promise.

12-2 Why has "with community input" been eliminated from this discussion. Collecting money from projects and using it citywide is an open invitation to reverse the commitment for offsetting community project impacts that has always been promised. (IM-276)

12-3 Add "and to address infrastructure, mobility and park requirements". (M-276)

12-4 The complete communities program and this Focus Plan has and will create significant impacts on transportation, parking, public services and park resources. the City will receive substantial tax base increases from development as well as permit fees and potential sales tax. Diverting or weakening the process for the collection and use of developer impact fees for local use is not acceptable. There needs to be a much greater assurance of processes and % of DIF collected to be used in Uptown for Uptown based growth and projects. (M-279)

12-5 TOT collected fees and future park bonding and funds should also be listed here on this table to expand more options. (M-279)

12-6 Since the district map in the previous plan showed a defined cultural district, and now it appears as though the entire plan focus area is the Cultural District, so therefore all areas are subject to these requirements even if they do not contain any cultural or historically designatable properties. Is this correct? (M-286)

Appendix E

E-1. Various comments on footnoting, source of information and abbreviations requiring a key (various pages)

E-2 As the property owner, with a final draft of an HRTR in hand, we request that this property be removed from the list based on findings in this study that include the following facts: 1) permits obtained in 1999 with a historic review that determined no potential historic designation, 2) the Center's use was past the LGBQT+ 1970-1990 period of significance; 3) no extra-ordinary events or persons were found to exist between 1993-1999; 4) the building has been changed and integrity lost from the 1947 construction date and from the 1993-1999 Center use of the building; 5) this listing was based on general public input and not professionally nominated nor was a status provided; 6) the property is not in any of the planned historic districts, 7) based on SDRs for the cultural district, the project will redevelop
with items that will support the Cultural District, 8) the Citywide Complete Community Plans and supporting environmental review provided findings with over-riding considerations that identified the public benefits that over-rides the impacts, and 9) the Focus plan goals and policies can not be met with an historical designation on this property which will result no investment in the property which is not an outcome will benefit the goals and policies of this plan, considering that office is no more the highest and best use or feasible use on this property.

Mike Singleton
Landscape Architect (PLA 2186),
American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) and
Certified Transportation Planner (CTP)

msingleton2@mac.com
3404 Front Street, SD
1-619-788-2128
I disagree with covering the 163 to create more housing. Hillcrest is already too crowded for the size of the area. Plus, the 163 is so beautiful! No one wants to drive thru a tunnel past what was once a beautiful green entrance to our downtown area.

As for creating tunnels and an overpass over the 5 Freeway, again, San Diego is special because of its views of the ocean and gorgeous green landscapes. Don't have San Diego looking like LA. All those tunnels and concrete walls will just be fodder for more graffiti, thus... looking like LA even more.
To whom it may concern,

First, I am a huge proponent of the Plan Hillcrest vision and love that it will significantly increase both residential density and safe mobility infrastructure. That said, I also wish it had more public space.

Therefore, upon reading about an old idea to add park space via a freeway lid over the 163 at KPBS today I wanted to write in to add that I would love for the Plan to explore such an option (or options like it).


Thanks!

Matt Brand
District 3 resident
Hi there,

In connection with the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment and the Plan Hillcrest initiative, I would kindly like to submit the following comments for your consideration:

Please consider adding in more publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure, including curbside Level 2 charging stations similar to what New York has recently installed: https://www.coned.com/en/our-energy-future/our-energy-vision/where-we-are-going/NYC-public-charging

These chargers could be along side streets, closer to Balboa Park, or near commercial districts.

Further, please consider adding in a large, centrally located public parking garage with substantial electric vehicle charging networks and DC fast charging stalls (possibly renovating the lot at Village Hillcrest shopping center). This would encourage residents living in apartments without access to home EV chargers to adopt electric vehicles for transportation. This would not be long term parking but focused instead on meeting the charging needs of an expanding population while incentivizing EV adoption. San Francisco has done something similar: https://media.electrifyamerica.com/en-us/releases/241

The plan still includes Class II & III bicycle facilities. Please consider adjusting the design of the streets to include Class IV, fully separated bikeways wherever possible.

Expand the existing dedicated transit lanes called for in the current draft, convert any peak-only transit only lanes to full-time transit only lanes.

Many streets are marked at “2-lane collectors” please include physical traffic calming measures to ensure traffic does not speed on these streets. Consider making all intersections in high or medium pedestrian areas include features such as raised crosswalks and speed humps.

Consider converting “2-lane” collector” streets to have only one lane of general traffic to further enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety. Use freed up space for dedicated transit, biking, and walking facilities.

Be bolder not just enhancing pedestrian safety in existing high walking traffic areas but create and induce demand for walking in more areas by making it safer and more pleasant in additional areas.

Please be bolder in lining the streets with trees to provide shade and combat climate change.
Consider that each area or neighborhood have distinctive street lamp posts to provide character and charm: Hillcrest would have their own style of lamp posts, as would Bankers Hill, University Heights, Mission Hills, etc.

Consider adding and commissioning areas for public art, including sculptures, murals, gardens, etc.

Thank you for your help and time and for considering these ideas in the plan.

Sincerely,
Andrew Burke
8582486829
Shannon,

Please find comments on the Draft March 2024 Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment from the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project. We appreciate this opportunity to comment and look forward to the evolution of the Plan Amendment.

Charles Kaminski, Historian
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project
858-956-9141

On Thu, Mar 21, 2024 at 9:44 AM PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment <planhillcrest@sandiego.gov> wrote:

Dear Charles,

The City Planning Department has completed the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, which amends the Uptown Community Plan. Your invaluable contributions have been crucial to this effort. A summary of changes from the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Community Discussion Draft for the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft and an updated rezoning map has been prepared.

Additionally, the City Planning Department has completed a draft Environmental Impact Report document. Please note that one comprehensive draft Environmental Impact Report has been prepared which analyzes Blueprint SD, the University Community Plan Update, and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Blueprint SD (General Plan Refresh) will guide future Community Plan Updates by generally showing where smart growth may occur in all communities.

Our team wanted to reach out to let you know these are now available, and we would welcome further feedback from you.

The draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_153d3945e599465e961088d2cbcb3ae.pdf The updated summary of changes can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_7e2a74c02c2147f3b032fd6ed7b0ab70.pdf We invite your feedback via email PlanHillcrest@SanDiego.gov by April 29, 2024, to help refine this plan.

The draft Environmental Impact Report can be accessed at the following link: https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/draft. Comments will be accepted via email to PlanningCEQA@sandiego.gov by April 29, 2024.

The updated rezoning map can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_c94a2dc1c7464e6ca99b1ba0bfac147d.pdf
Please reach out if you have any questions and we'd be happy to discuss them with you. Thank you for your ongoing commitment. Your insights are vital in shaping the future of Hillcrest.

Best wishes,

Selena Sanchez Bailon

She/her/hers |  Why do pronouns matter?

Assistant Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T (619) 533-4804
sandiego.gov
SSanchezBail@sandiego.gov

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
I apologize. The previous attachment referred to Chapter 6 and 11: Historic Preservation

The attachment is corrected to just refer to the correct Chapter 11 for Historic Preservation. All other comments remain the same.

Charles Kaminski

On Fri, Apr 26, 2024 at 3:44 PM Charles Kaminski <charleskaminski23@gmail.com> wrote:
Shannon,
Please find comments on the Draft March 2024 Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment from the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project. We appreciate this opportunity to comment and look forward to the evolution of the Plan Amendment.

Charles Kaminski, Historian
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project
858-956-9141

On Thu, Mar 21, 2024 at 9:44 AM PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment <planhillcrest@sandiego.gov> wrote:

Dear Charles,

The City Planning Department has completed the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, which amends the Uptown Community Plan. Your invaluable contributions have been crucial to this effort. A summary of changes from the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Community Discussion Draft for the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft and an updated rezoning map has been prepared.

Additionally, the City Planning Department has completed a draft Environmental Impact Report document. Please note that one comprehensive draft Environmental Impact Report has been prepared which analyzes Blueprint SD, the University Community Plan Update, and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Blueprint SD (General Plan Refresh) will guide future Community Plan Updates by generally showing where smart growth may occur in all communities.

Our team wanted to reach out to let you know these are now available, and we would welcome further feedback from you.

The draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_153d3945e599465e961088d2cbcb3aee.pdf.
The
updated summary of changes can be accessed at the following link:  
https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_7e2a74c02c2147f3b032fd6ed7b0ab70.pdf. We invite your feedback via email PlanHillcrest@SanDiego.gov by April 29, 2024, to help refine this plan.

The draft Environmental Impact Report can be accessed at the following link:  
https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/draft. Comments will be accepted via email to PlanningCEQA@sandiego.gov by April 29, 2024.

The updated rezoning map can be accessed at the following link:  
https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_c94a2dc1c7464e6ca99b1ba0bfac147d.pdf.

Please reach out if you have any questions and we'd be happy to discuss them with you. Thank you for your ongoing commitment. Your insights are vital in shaping the future of Hillcrest.

Best wishes,

**Selena Sanchez Bailon**

*She/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?*

Assistant Planner  
City of San Diego  
City Planning Department

T (619) 533-4804

sandiego.gov

SSanchezBail@sandiego.gov

**CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION**

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
Planning to add tens of thousands residential units in Hillcrest, with limited parking, we desperately need trolley service here. Buses don't cut it. They are good for getting downtown, but if you need to go anywhere else in the city, a bus ride will take from twice to four times longer than driving.

There should be no plan to substantially increase housing units that does not require the trolley coming to Hillcrest. It also makes sense for North Park and Mission Hills. Folks cannot afford $40+ each day Uber to get to work and back. Without a good mass transit system, you're building a future nightmare.

Frank Wilms
where the Bicycle Boulevard is proposed. We believe this would align well with the adopted 2021 Regional Plan. From a safety perspective, reducing the motor vehicle volumes on W. University Avenue will significantly improve safety on this roadway.

Sixth Avenue Planned Street Classification and Bikeway Facility Type

We do not believe any Planned Transit Facilities considerations would preclude City of San Diego staff from updating the Planned Street Classification and Planned Bicycle Facility type of Sixth Avenue from Upas Street to University Avenue consistent with the same designations for Sixth Avenue south of Upas Street to Elm Street. A consistent 2-Lane Collector Planned Street Classification for Sixth Avenue north of Pennsylvania Avenue to University Avenue, and Planned Bicycle Facility type of Lane Dividers (from Upas Street to University Avenue) to be a benefit to the community realized sooner than any planned transit project may use this alignment. Furthermore, any Planned Transit Facilities on Sixth Avenue will need to be designed throughout this entire alignment.

SANDAG’s Regional Plan designates this section of Sixth Avenue as a light rail/streetcar corridor with an implementation phase year of 2050. In the intervening years, a consistent bicycle facility experience from University Ave to Elm St will create a continuous experience for people biking, facilitating critical east/west connections in the network. This recommendation is an important addition to the Hillcrest Focus Plan Amendment and will create safer crossing conditions at intersections and through movement on midblock segments for all modes, particularly vulnerable road users.

Adopted Regional Bike Network Alignment

We recommend the City of San Diego examine more ways to align with the Adopted Regional Bikeway Network by enhancing safety on the west side of the focused plan area – West University Avenue to the westernmost extent of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Boundary at Dowe Street.

Title page below on how motor vehicle speeds on West University Avenue have become much greater than its designed target volumes, the Focused Plan should designate some or all of West University Avenue to a roadway classification type consistent with the State Highway Bikeway Network Guidance for implementing the proposed Bicycle Network Treatment. For example, to implement a bicycle boulevard as initially considered by SANDAG this will require Volume Management Strategies – road classification, diverters, and other management measures to achieve an appropriate Target Motor Vehicle Speed. Referenced below, SANDAG developed a solution, proposed in the Uptown Regional Bike Corridors Comprehensive Report 2014. In the Uptown Regional Bike Corridors comprehensive report, how should the adopted target volume be adjusted for the TML and the additional "Additional Traffic".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MRM</strong></th>
<th><strong>NHTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>1.0</strong></th>
<th><strong>0.8</strong></th>
<th><strong>0.6</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT: Referenced link and expire 6/7/2024 with 2 partial diverters which, if implemented, detailed traffic studies in appendix K of that document determined, "Washington Street has enough capacity to accommodate the additional traffic." To implement a bicycle boulevard as initially considered by SANDAG this will require Volume Management Strategies – road classification, diverters, and other management measures to achieve an appropriate Target Motor Vehicle Speed.

Between the November 2023 and March 2024 update of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, SANDAG finalized a draft of the Safety Focus Network with member agencies including the City of San Diego. The Safety Focus Network is essentially where the highest proportion of fatalities and severe injuries are occurring. SANDAG has developed a solution, proposed in the Uptown Regional Bike Corridors comprehensive report, how should the adopted target volume be adjusted for the TML and the additional "Additional Traffic."

Mara Mangan (ajourney)
Senior Mobility Strategist
619.595.5614 mobile
401 B Street, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92101

SANDAG | Pursuing a brighter future for all
Learn about our commitment to equity.
SANDAG Office Hours: Tuesday – Friday and every other Monday from 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

From: Josh Clark <josh.clark@sandiego.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 3:32 PM
To: Thomas DeFranco <Thomas.Defranco@sandiego.gov>; Maria Mangan <María.Mangan@sandiego.gov>; Zaccary Bolling <Zkhali.bolling@sandiego.gov>;
Mercado, Christine <CMercado@sandiego.gov>; Lang, Dana <Dana.Lang@sandiego.gov>; Mulderig, Shannon <SMulderig@sandiego.gov>;
Brizuela, Claudia <CBrizuela@sandiego.gov>;
Pierce, Sarah <SPierce@sandiego.gov>
Cc: Chris Kluth <Chris.Kluth@sandag.org>; Madai Parra <Madai.Parra@sandag.org>
Subject: RE: SANDAG<>City of San Diego | Draft Mobility Master Plan & Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment Coordination

Thank you all for an opportunity to meet last week.

I'm following up to share some SANDAG studies and concepts within the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Boundary. It is specifically on W. University Avenue [Uptown Bikeway Segment 4] where the bicycle boulevard is proposed. Referencing the NACTO Bikeway Network Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways, a Bicycle Boulevard shouldn't have greater than 2,000 Motor Vehicle Volume ADT and 200 ADT on this road is 23% greater than that target volume (see FIG)." The preliminary diversion analysis shows that the partial diverters would reduce the cut-through traffic on University Avenue on this section by 10,000 ADT, resulting in daily volumes in the desired range to create an effective bike boulevard. This solution, proposed in the Uptown Regional Bike Corridors Comprehensive Report 2014, is the result of 2 partial diverters which, if implemented, detailed traffic studies in appendix K of that document determined, "Washington Street has enough capacity to accommodate the additional traffic."

Reducing the motor vehicle volumes on W. University Avenue will significantly improve safety on this roadway. During SANDAG’s recent work identifying a Regional High Injury Network (renamed a “Safety Focus Network”), W. University Ave is one of only 9 segments in the region's entire roadway network with the unfortunate distinction of being on the Pedestrian, Bicycle, Motorcycle, and Motor Vehicle High Injury Networks. This is tragic—unfortunate, but perhaps unsurprising when looking at a (screenshot below) and identifying Douglas Street as it was originally called) was built as a dead-end residential street, unintended to be connected to a 4-lane arterial - the rebuilt Washington Street.

We appreciate your efforts in helping to improve this, and all other segments of the Regional Bike Network. We hope to support you however we can at SANDAG and look forward to all opportunities for continued collaboration.

*This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**
Josh Clark
Senior Active Transportation Planner
619.699.6906-office
411 B Street, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92101

SANDAG | Pursuing a brighter future for all

Learn about our commitment to equity
SANDAG office hours are Tuesday – Friday and every other Monday from 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Thomas DeFranco <Thomas.DeFranco@sandag.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 12:22 PM
To: Josh Clark
Subject: FW: SANDAG<>City of San Diego | Draft Mobility Master Plan & Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment Coordination

When: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 3:00 PM-4:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Thomas DeFranco
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2024 9:45 AM
To: Thomas DeFranco; Jennifer Williamson; Brian Lane; Marisa Mangan; Zaccary Bradt; Zach Hernandez; Khalisa Bolling; From, Philip; Danielle Kochman; Mercado, Christine; Long, Dana; Middendorf, Brian; Brizuela, Claudia
Subject: SANDAG<>City of San Diego | Draft Mobility Master Plan & Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment Coordination
When: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 3:00 PM-4:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

"Update": re-scheduling to 2/27 to accommodate schedules

For SANDAG Staff:
City of SD Mobility Master Plan
Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment Coordination

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device
Click here to join the meeting

Meeting ID: 241 777 212 649
Passcode: sjrRKU

Or call in (audio only)
+1 619-468-5670,,956005416#
United States, San Diego
Phone Conference ID: 956 005 416#

Learn More | Meeting options
Hello,

My name is Jack Moyle, and I live in the Talmadge neighborhood. I frequently ride my bicycle in the MidCity and Uptown areas, and while that is enjoyable, I would much rather ride quick transit. Please consider including in the Hillcrest FPA language that indicates that the Park Blvd dedicated transit lane gap be closed. I would also like language included that indicate plans for increasing density, such as dedicated transit lanes on the 4th and 5th Ave couplet.

Thank you for your time,

Jack Moyle
(850) 566-9500
Thank you. Part of what makes Hillcrest and the other San Diego historic neighborhoods enjoyable to residents and visitors is that they are neighborhoods, with trees, and open space. San Diego has many other places to build but unfortunately everyone feels they need to live near the coast. Hillcrest and the surrounding areas are becoming more like downtown Los Angeles every day. I know, my son lives there and I was born there. I have lived in San Diego since 1975. Do you know where people want to go when they visit? Old Town, Little Italy, India Street.. because you can’t get that everywhere, or it seems anywhere if we keep building high rises and increasing cars on the streets of our small urban neighborhoods. There’s a balance. And the scale of building in Hillcrest by developers have tipped it far past. I think a better plan would be to incorporate more public restrooms and community centers (with green open space) for residents and visitors. How about a visitor center to highlight and continue the unique significance of our community in terms of its diversity? How about a community garden where people with children (or no children) can have a space to cultivate outside? How about a designated Farmers Market area that can be mixed use during the week or invite other growers (or artisans) in on different days? How about a food pantry? This is what our community needs. Not more overpriced “affordable” housing that blocks out light for blocks around and makes money for a select few while destroying the fabric of this vibrant and loving community.

Thank you for your time and patience,
Mary Norton

> On Apr 10, 2024, at 9:15 AM, PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment <planhillcrest@sandiego.gov> wrote:
> 
> Hello Mary,
>
> All feedback received on the Draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.
>
> As always, thank you for participating in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.
>
> Best,
>
> Aparna Padmakumar
> Associate Planner
> City of San Diego
> City Planning Department
> apadmakumar@sandiego.gov


Hi,

I have lived in San Diego since 1975. It’s changed a lot. Some change is good and necessary. Some is default and driven by investors. Hillcrest is not just a unique place to live but to go. Keeping it a neighborhood, charming, & available to all will ensure its longevity. Affordable housing in Hillcrest is not affordable to most people. A lot of people who work & live in Hillcrest share houses and resources that will be unavailable if properties and businesses continue to be taken down for newer and “better”.

Thank you so much,

Mary Norton
San Diego, CA
Connor,

Thank you for submitting feedback on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft Community Plan. All feedback received will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will then go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.

The City is committed to meaningful community engagement and welcomes all productive feedback.

If you have any questions, please contact us at PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov and keep up to date on the project by visiting the Plan Hillcrest website and signing up for our mailing list.

Thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)
she/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Senior Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

---

**This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.**
Hi Shannon and Claudia,

I hope you're having a good week! Thanks for all your work on the Hillcrest Plan. I'm writing on behalf of RideSD to provide an additional bit of feedback in regards to transit lanes in the area. Thanks for your attention to these matters.

I'm attaching a PDF of our letter to this email and copy/pasting the text of it below.

Dear City Planning Department,

RideSD is a grassroots non-profit organization dedicated to educating the public at large on transit, and advocating for improvements to our transit infrastructure that will increase ridership.

We are incredibly appreciative of City Planning staff for incorporating RideSD’s initial recommendations into the updated draft of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (FPA). The explicit policies on dedicated transit lanes and clearer language on transit signal priority is great.

The new draft also proposes more dedicated transit lanes. The proposed lanes are fantastic, and RideSD would only like to make the following final recommendations:

- **Complete the Park Boulevard Gap.** Park Boulevard contains dedicated transit lanes for much of its length. However, there is a crucial gap between Upas Street and University Avenue. This gap can cause the bus lane network from Balboa Park to El Cajon Boulevard to fail when we need it the most (e.g., December Nights). RideSD recommends the Hillcrest FPA plan for this gap to be filled.

- **Plan *Future* Bus Lanes on 4th and 5th Avenues:** The new plan proposes significantly more density in Hillcrest. When combined with the densifying Bankers Hill, and the existing dense Downtown, residents will need an efficient transit option between the three neighborhoods. RideSD recommends that the City plan for a future in which 4th and 5th Avenues have dedicated transit lanes so that residents have that option.

The proposed increase in residential density will help alleviate our housing crisis. However, it's imperative that density is supported by proven transportation investments like dedicated lanes with transit signal priority. Without this, we risk exacerbating traffic congestion and failing to meet our climate and health goals. Our recommendations also consider those reliant on transit, such as seniors, youth, low-income residents, and the disabled.

Thank you again *so much* for considering our input in shaping a more transit-
friendly and sustainable Hillcrest. Please feel free to contact us at contact@ridesd.org.

Thanks,
Connor Proctor
RideSD
Nicole,

Will do. Thank you!

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)
she/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Senior Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

---

Thank you so much for sharing this!

We will take a look and let you know if we have any feedback. Also, I now work for Lambda Archives, so if you could send future emails to nverdes@lambdaarchives.org that would be great.

Thanks so much!

Nicole
On Thu, Mar 21, 2024 at 9:41 AM PLN Hillcrest Focused Amendment <planhillcrest@sandiego.gov> wrote:

Dear Nicole and Dana,

The City Planning Department has completed the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, which amends the Uptown Community Plan. Your invaluable contributions have been crucial to this effort. A summary of changes from the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Community Discussion Draft for the draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft and an updated rezoning map has been prepared.

Additionally, the City Planning Department has completed a draft Environmental Impact Report document. Please note that one comprehensive draft Environmental Impact Report has been prepared which analyzes Blueprint SD, the University Community Plan Update, and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Blueprint SD (General Plan Refresh) will guide future Community Plan Updates by generally showing where smart growth may occur in all communities.

Our team wanted to reach out to let you know these are now available, and we would welcome further feedback from you.

The draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_153d3945e599465e961088d2cbbc3aee.pdf. The updated summary of changes can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_7e2a74c02c2147f3b032fd6ed7b0ab70.pdf. We invite your feedback via email PlanHillcrest@SanDiego.gov by April 29, 2024, to help refine this plan.

The draft Environmental Impact Report can be accessed at the following link: https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/draft. Comments will be accepted via email to PlanningCEO@sandiego.gov by April 29, 2024.

The updated rezoning map can be accessed at the following link: https://www.planhillcrest.org/_files/ugd/987270_c94a2dc1c7464e6ca99b1ba0bfac147d.pdf.

Please reach out if you have any questions and we'd be happy to discuss them with you. Thank you for your ongoing commitment. Your insights are vital in shaping the future of Hillcrest.

Best wishes,

Selena Sanchez Bailon
Shannon Corr or To Whom it May Concern,

I’m writing to express my displeasure with the proposed rezoning and Plan Hillcrest proposal.

The previous changes allowing buildings higher than 3 stories has already changed the character of the community and the current proposal will make that change more drastic.

I understand the need for more housing in San Diego, however I’m not in favor of Hillcrest bearing the brunt of it.

I originally bought my condo in Hillcrest because I liked the mix of homes and 2 story condos & apartments. It was a quiet walkable community and easy to get to local businesses by car. This is no longer the case. With highrises being built to house hundreds of people who both walk and drive everyday life has become unpleasant. It’s a challenge to get a parking spot at the bank, grocery store, FedEx Store. Also, there is often a line of cars in front of my garage waiting to get through a stop sign down the road which prevents me from turning left out of the garage. This is caused by not enough infrastructure to support the added cars as well as pedestrians crossing the street and ambulances mucking up traffic as the come off the freeway.

In all honesty, if I’d wanted to live in a noisy community with high rise buildings, I would have bought downtown. That is not what I want and I believe it’s discriminatory to choose a community and change its character without a vote of the residents. I’ve paid my taxes and vote in elections Im a retired school teacher and am not in the financial position to buy another property in a different location.

I don’t believe you, the decision makers, would be happy with your civic leaders if they up a decided to change the character of your neighborhood by building high rises and adding 50,000 more residents.

I propose adding more skyscrapers downtown and not in neighborhoods.

Nancy Back

Sent from my iPhone
Our LGBTQ+ community has a new website www.OurTownSD.org to connect to local services & your group is included. It’s a Resource Guide to San Diego LGBTQ+ Service, Arts & Athletic Groups, Their Annual Events plus Major National Organizations & Observances. Check it out & spread the word. The purpose is to help folks find local LGBTQ+ services plus promote the agencies & groups like yours dedicated to our community. I hope folks attend your events & help you by becoming a volunteer or donor.

OurTown SanDiego is an all-volunteer nonprofit & educational activity of www.POZabilities.org

Traveling to LA or SF? See www.OurTownLA.org or https://www.facebook.com/ourtownsf
Why do you want to cram more buildings onto a space that is already over-stuffed and has outdated infrastructure?? What about yards, and places to play for children and pets? Why not build a community like this in an open area, like they did in East Chula Vista? They have room for everything that's needed there, as in roads, infrastructure, schools, parks, businesses, restaurants, etc. etc. And it's worked out really well there.

Is it just that you want the coveted, valuable land in the Hillcrest, North Park and surrounding areas? To make lots of money and look nice for the tourists?

Thank you,
Vivian Bradley
District 3
Good evening Plan Hillcrest Team,

I was remembering a nagging thought in the back of my mind during the Vibrant Uptown Town Hall regarding the Bus Lanes in the plan. After taking another look at the document, I'm a little worried about the efficacy of the planned route for the future Next-Gen-BRT #10 bus route. The current Eastbound #10 bus route jogs over to University Ave from Washington St at Albatross St. In the future street alignment plan, this couldn't work because University Ave is planned to become one-way in this section.

It appears instead that the new Eastbound BRT-#10 route will make that jog over from Washington St to University Ave at 9th Ave. This bothers me because I foresee it really causing slow-downs for this bus route, given that the dedicated bus lanes on Washington St stop at 5th Ave. The section of Washington St between 5th Ave and 9th Ave already slows down due to vehicle traffic, largely as a result of cars trying to get on CA-163. In order to implement a true "rapid" bus, I would strongly ask that the dedicated bus lanes on Washington St continue through 9th Ave.

Again I thank you for your hard work, and am constantly looking forward to a better Uptown!

-Alex
Hello,

All feedback received on the Draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will then go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.

As always, thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Best,

Aparna Padmakumar
Associate Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department
apadmakumar@sandiego.gov
Dear City Planning Department,

My name is Alex and I am a renter living in Hillcrest. I attended the Vibrant Uptown Town Hall on the amended Plan Hillcrest and was very excited to see and share in the community’s enthusiasm for the future of this amazing neighborhood. I am so glad to see much needed improvements to the zoning in the area, as well as vital transportation accommodations like bus lanes and bike lanes.

The transit priority lanes planned for Hillcrest and Mission Hills will be one of the most important and biggest improvements to the bus system yet for Uptown. I regularly take the 10 bus to Old Town for my commute to Torrey Pines. By far the longest segment of that commute is the Uptown segment, which can take up to 35 min with evening traffic. Adding and extending transit priority lanes will be absolutely necessary as an incentive to get commuters to take alternative transportation modes to work, especially with the planned density increases to the area. I do however believe that transit priority lanes should exist on 4th and 5th Avenues in order to speed up one of the slowest parts of the route through the heart Hillcrest. i would like to see other bus lane gaps filled throughout the area as well, including those on Park Blvd.

The planned bicycle infrastructure improvements are great as well. I am enormously excited for more Class IV bike lanes and am itching to attend the Farmers Market on the new Normal St Promenade. But the planned bicycle facilities also pass over a major problem area: West University Avenue through Mission Hills. I truly believe bike lanes are needed on this stretch, as I am often passed aggressively while riding through here. Barring bike lanes, other infrastructure must be placed to make it clear that micro mobility should take PRIORITY over automobiles in this section. The end goal should be a safe and efficient
bicycle route from Uptown directly to Washing St Trolley Station, connecting Uptown to our world class Trolley system and the rest of the region.

Within Uptown I would love to see other improvements to the pedestrian experience. Ideally this would mean regular if not permanent closure of 163 through Balboa Park, returning the space to the Park it so noisily bisects. Alternatively a Cap over the 163 would add much needed pedestrian space over the Robinson and University overpasses.

Overall, the Plan shows that we as a city know how to build a modern, multimodal, vibrant, and healthy neighborhood. I appreciate all the work that has gone into it, and cannot wait to see it come to life!

Thank you,

Alex Graff
Dean Glass,

Thank you for submitting feedback on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft Community Plan. All feedback received will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will then go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.

The City is committed to meaningful community engagement and welcomes all productive feedback.

If you have any questions, please contact us at PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov and keep up to date on the project by visiting the Plan Hillcrest website and signing up for our mailing list.

Thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)
she/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Senior Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
Good afternoon, Shannon,

Please see SOHO's comments for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, attached here.

Thank you,

Dean Glass
Administrative Manager
Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO)
Office: 3525 Seventh Avenue • San Diego, CA 92103
Mailing: PO Box 80788 • San Diego, CA 92138-0788
619-297-9327 (Office)

PROTECTING SAN DIEGO'S ARCHITECTURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE SINCE 1969
SOHOsandiego.org
eNews | Facebook

Membership starts at just $25
Join SOHO today
Mike,

Thank you for submitting feedback on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft Community Plan. We will reach out to you if we have any questions/need clarification on the letter you sent on behalf of the LGBTQ+ Cultural Advisory Group.

All feedback received will be thoroughly reviewed and considered for the final draft, which will then go through the public hearing process, where community members will have additional opportunities to comment on it. The final plan will ultimately be presented to the City Council for adoption this summer.

The City is committed to meaningful community engagement and welcomes all productive feedback.

If you have any questions, please contact us at PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov and keep up to date on the project by visiting the Plan Hillcrest website and signing up for our mailing list.

Thank you for your participation in the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Thank you,

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)  
she/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?  
Senior Planner  
City of San Diego  
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662  
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION  
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.
Hi Shannon,

Please see the attached comments on the latest Hillcrest FPA draft. The plan is looking great!

Thank you,
Mike

Michael Hansen, AICP
City Forward LLC
p: 619 944 6590
w: cityforwardfirm.com
Hi Carol,

The link for the print-ready version has higher resolutions, and you can zoom in on specific streets and parcels. Let me know if this works. If not, we can try another approach.

Also, to clarify:

Pages 26-36 are the last page of the Introduction chapter and the first 10 pages of the Land Use chapter.

Thanks,
Alex
Hi Carol,

Here are those pages extracted from the larger document. I hope they are easier to navigate. You may need to zoom into the maps to see the details. If there is a certain area of the map you would like me to send you a zoomed-in version, we can do that as well.

Thank you,

Shannon Corr (Mulderig)

shel/her/hers | Why do pronouns matter?
Senior Planner
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.533.3662
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION
This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

Dear Ms. Mulderig,

Please send me enhanced or easy to read copies of pages 26-36.
I find the designations of proposed activities on streets very difficult to read as I am now legally blind.
Thank you.
Carol Emerick
Dear Plan Hillcrest,

Thank you so much for your continued interest in community outreach and collecting the sum of feedback to create a long-term plan for the Hillcrest Community. I have one more piece of feedback that I would like to see included as a possibility within the plan.

Please consider the capping for the 163 freeway between Washington Street, University Avenue, 9th Street, and 10th Avenue. Currently, this rectangle is an unnatural disconnect that separates Hillcrest from itself and surrounding communities, including University Heights, which is largely cut-off due to the accessibility of Washington. The incremental space earned for the community will be at a level of foot, bike, and transit of the community, allowing the freeway to continue to run under the community, but without disruption.

The new space would create land that can be used for parks, multi-family housing, community services, and connectivity. This freeway cap could be extended further South to Robinson Avenue, providing even further connectivity to Balboa Park.

The result would be replacing what are now, three automobile-centric bottlenecks with one, contiguous opportunity to connect the neighborhoods together with multi-model transportation, housing, and vibrance, restoring social connections and promoting community cohesion.

Other benefits will include removal of noise pollution from traffic, reduction of air pollution caused by containing vehicle emissions, and greater aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood and provide residents with places for relaxation and recreation in the heart of Hillcrest. With greater space, it will allow for multi-modal transportation, inherently enhancing pedestrian and cyclist safety. Promoting active transportation: By providing safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, freeway caps can encourage walking and cycling as alternative modes of transportation, reducing reliance on cars and promoting healthier lifestyles.

Currently, that area of Hillcrest is short of economic development, due to the unusable and unconnected spaces adjacent to the 163. Capping these sections of the 163 corridor into usable space can attract businesses, investors, and developers, leading to economic revitalization in the surrounding area. New developments such as housing, retail, or office space will contribute to job creation and increased property values, enhancing the vibrancy of the neighborhood.

Please see the map below for the impacted area.

Thank you very much.

-Wesley Morgan

4472 Hortensia Street
San Diego, CA 92103
(310) 980 4937
City Planners,

The link to the model used (ABM2 + the SANDAG Activity Based Model) in determining the VMT impact does not work.

It is critical in understanding the reported reduction in VMT for residents based on the Hillcrest Plan Update or any other transportation work. It seems that these reductions require public transportation updates, but no details were provided. I would hope that there are some city planners that can explain in everyday terms the features of the modeling that produced the results shown.

Roy Dahl
November 14, 2023

City of San Diego
Planning Department
202 C Street, M.S. 413
San Diego, CA 92101

VIA ELECTRONIC EMAIL: PlanHillcrest@sandiego.gov

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO’S HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE UPTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN COMMUNITY DISCUSSION DRAFT

The County of San Diego (County) staff has reviewed the City of San Diego’s Community Discussion Draft of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, dated October 2023.

County staff appreciates the opportunity to review the Plan Amendment and offers the following comments for your consideration. Please note that none of these comments should be construed as County support for this Plan Amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

The County of San Diego is the property owner of Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 444-110-21-00, which is within the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Boundary.

1. Section 2.2 Land Use Framework. Request an additional land use policy following the Institutional discussion that reads, “Consider the reuse of the County of San Diego property, former Hillcrest Receiving Home, on Third Avenue which could include high residential development, institutional uses, and/or public and semi-public facilities.”

2. Page RE-141, Figure 8-1: Parks, Recreation Facilities and Open Space. Request removal of mapping designation of ‘Public Open Space Parcel’ from the County parcel APN: 444-110-21-00.

The County appreciates the opportunity to comment on this plan amendment. We look forward to receiving future documents related to this plan amendment and providing additional assistance, at your request. Please feel free to contact me or my staff, Elyce Shorb, Chief Strategic Facility Planning at (619)458-4499 or via e-mail at Elyce.Shorb@sdcounty.ca.gov should you have any questions,

Regards,

Carrie Hoff
Deputy Director, Asset Management Division
Department of General Services
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project

April 26, 2024

Shannon Mulderig
Senior Planner
City Planning Department
City of San Diego

RE: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft March 2024
Chapter 5: LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation

The San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project (The Project) welcomes this opportunity to offer its comments to the March 2024 Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft regarding Chapter 5: LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation components.

Many of our comments repeat what we have previously offered in October of 2023 and some of which do not appear to have been incorporated into this revised March 2024 Draft. It is noted that Chapter 6: Historic Preservation incorporates many of the following comments; however, Chapter 5 should have similar statements to form the necessary linkage between culture and history.

The idea of an LGBTQ+ cultural district is a welcome component to the Uptown Plan. By emphasizing signage, interpretative element, colors and graphics, the Cultural District appears to be engaging in “rainbow washing”. However a cultural component should not overshadow specifically designated LGBTQ+ historic sites and potential LGBTQ+ historic sites in the Uptown Plan area. Designated and potential designated historic sites can be the linkages and the glue that ties past to present to future and form the anchors and threads of interpretive elements that link memory and progress as a cultural district develops overtime.

There is no specific language in Chapter 5 that emphasizes the importance of identifying designated historic LGBTQ+ sites (only one) and potentially significant historic LGBTQ+ sites (many). They appear to be identified in Chapter 11: Historic Preservation but a statement must be included in Chapter 5. (Contained in Chapter 6 but should also duplicate in Chapter 5)

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District must have as a goal the preservation, maintenance and promotion of local LGBTQ+ history. Preserving historical assets such as buildings, traditions, events, etc. can be found in other cities LGBTQ+ cultural districts. The same should be true for Hillcrest and San Diego.
5.0 LGBTQ+ Cultural Districts

This section should specifically state in "Key Objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District” that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. Additionally this section should specifically state that identifying potential LGBTQ+ historic sites will add additional LGBTQ+ history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops.

The "Key Objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District” should acknowledge, in addition to entertainment and commercial business establishments, the importance of social service agencies and community based organizations as a significant part of LGBTQ+ culture and history.

5.2 History + Culture

On LC-139 in addition to the photo of the first center location in Golden Hill, we recommend adding a photo of the LGBTQ+ Center when it moved from Golden Hill to Hillcrest at Fifth Avenue. The Center/Gayzette/Albert Bell Building is Hillcrest’s only specifically City of San Diego dedicated historic site. Although slated for development this was ground zero for AIDS and the LGBTQ+ town center as AIDS decimated the gay community. On page LC-149, the Walking Corridor and Sites Map Site #9 name should reflect the officially historically designated site name. The former location of Obelisk Bookstore at 1029 University, while listed in Appendix E, should be included. Likewise Albert Bell’s final residence at 3815 Vermont Street should be located on the map.

5.3 Outreach + Stories

“Community Identified Issues” should include the Trans and API community along with Black, BIPOC and Indigenous. This section should specifically state that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. Many of the sites served as meeting places and fundraising locations for overlooked and frequently marginalized LGBTQ+ peoples.

5.3 Interpretive Elements

The Project supports the incorporation of interpretive elements and recommends the avoidance of standard plaques and landmarks. At the same time, The Project stresses the avoidance of “rainbow washing” in artwork, buildings, streetscapes, signage, etc. Plaques and installations are secondary to actual physical sites.

Adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, repurposing are options that can integrate old and new. Additionally these sections should specifically state that identifying potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can add additional history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops. Avoid “rainbow washing” and highlight cultural and historic sites. The architecture of the LGBTQ+ sites is coincidental to what happened there and who was
involved. The Stonewall Inn in New York, a National Monument, is designated for its event. The building as it exists now is not the same as it was when the Stonewall riots occurred in 1969.

These interpretive elements should utilize a family of components that truly links the district and provides the excitement of the pedestrian and visitor to move from history to entertainment to just celebrating culture of LGBTQ+ Hillcrest. Designated LGBTQ+ historic sites and potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can be used as landmarks that truly tell the story of the community. Locating these interpretative elements at historic sites (both designated and potential) set up a “true rainbow” of linkages and nodes that can become community focal points.

The Cultural District should have a strong financial backed maintenance program to avoid these elements from becoming worn, deteriorated, and graffitified as well as a time line for implementation. If individual businesses are expected to provide these components, we foresee a long “waiting period.”

5.5 Walking Corridor + Site

The Project offers the following be incorporated:

- # 9 Albert Bell’s Residence at 3780-3786 Fifth Avenue should use the official historic designated name: The Center/Gayzette/Albert Bell Building.
- The San Diego AIDS Project was located at 3777 Fourth Avenue (across the alley from # 9 and should be identified.
- The AIDS epidemic in the 1980s established AIDS services at Vauclain Point at the north edge of Front Street (the former site of a SD County facility and later the SD Hospice). That area along with #16 UCSD Owen Clinic has a long history related to AIDS and Hillcrest.
- The Obelisk Bookstore at 1037 University was a landmark bookstore for the LGBTQ+ community.
- The SAGE of California Center at 3138 Fifth Avenue was an important location and drop-in center for lesbians and gay men when it opened in 1999.
- Albert Bell’s final residence at 3815 Vermont Street should be located on the map.
- Contact Lambda Archives for the location of an electrolysis business on University Avenue that served the Trans community.

The Project will gladly work with city staff to refine and provide additional sites for consideration and inclusion.
5.6 POLICY

As previously stated in 5.3, incorporate in CD-2 the Trans, Black, BIPOC, API, Indigenous LGBTQ+ community stories into the LGBTQ+ Cultural District.

As discussed in the comments previously, this section should include and specifically state a policy that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. Additional these sections should specifically state that identifying potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can add additional history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops.

Chapter 6: Historic Preservation

On HP-230 “No resources reflecting the fifth and final theme of development (1970-present) are currently listed on the City’s Register” is incorrect as The Center/Gayzette/Albert Bell Building at 3780 Fifth Avenue is a designated resource.

In conclusion, Chapter 5 LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 6: Historic Preservation should work together for the preservation and designation of LGBTQ+ historic sites. By acknowledging, preserving and incorporating the LGBTQ+ history of Hillcrest past, only then can Hillcrest truly engage with the LGBTQ+ present and future. The San Diego Historic Site Projects looks forward to working with City Planning in its evolution of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Charles S. Kaminski

Charles Kaminski, Historian, Architect, Preservationist
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project
PO Box 2729
La Jolla, CA 92038
858-956-9141
RE: Hillcrest Plan Amendment      May 7, 2024
To: Uptown Planners, City Planners, Traffic Planners
Agenda Item  VI. Action Items  #2
STOP

“The over-riding goal of the Uptown Community Plan is
to conserve and accommodate growth
in proper intensity
at appropriate locations:

To preserve and enhance the various assets of the community;
and
to prevent urban pressures from destroying the amenities that
create the values that Uptown enjoys today.”

Appendix EE: Urban Design Case Study Uptown Community Plan, p. 99

The Hillcrest Plan Amendment, 2024, will suffocate neighborhoods.

Transportation corridors along University Place cut through Florence Canyon.
Adding enhanced roadway along Robinson Avenue, will encircle and entomb the 3800 block of Albatross Street.

You have made the neighborhood an island in the middle of your transportation system.

See pages 26-36 of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment

When a commuter rail line and/or #11 bus line is put through Florence Canyon and Robinson Avenue is “enhanced”
how many trees will be destroyed by asphalt assault and rail lines?

How much tree canopy will be replaced with sun?
What will the temperature be when the sun beats down on treeless city streets, concrete covered lots devoid of shade, adjacent to a concrete canyon?

How will carbon sequestration be affected?
How will the Climate Action Plan be affected?

Consider what you are doing to the neighborhoods

Please, STOP this overbearing destructive plan, please.
How about utilizing the the Uptown Community Plan Update 2016???

Carol Emerick
3800 block of Albatross Street
where the Bicycle Boulevard is proposed. Referencing the NACTO Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways connects community destinations and links surrounding communities and the regional bicycle network. We believe this would align well with the adopted 2021 Regional Plan Appendix L: Active Transportation Motorcycle, and Motor Vehicle High Injury Networks. This is tragically unfortunate, but perhaps unsurprising when looking at a historical map (renamed a “Safety Focus Network”), W. University Ave is one of only 9 segments in the region’s entire roadway network with the unfortunate distinction of being on the Pedestrian, Bicycle, Reducing the motor vehicle volumes on W. University Avenue will significantly improve safety on this roadway. During SANDAG’s recent work identifying a Regional High Injury Network (as it was originally called) was built as a dead-end residential street, unintended to be connected to a 4-lane arterial - the rebuilt Washington Street.

We appreciate your efforts in helping to improve this, and all other segments of the Regional Bike Network. We hope to support you however we can at SANDAG and look forward to all opportunities for continued collaboration.

Chris Kluth <chris.kluth@sandiego.gov>; Sarah Zaccary Bradt <sbradt@sandiego.gov>; Thomas Delfranco <thomas.delfranco@sandiego.gov>; Zaccary Bracht <zaccary.bracht@sandiego.gov>; Zach Hernandez <zach.hernandez@sandiego.gov>; Khalisa Bolling <khalisa.bolling@sandiego.gov>; Chris Khalia <chris.rollins@sandiego.gov>; Maria Mangan <maria.mangan@sandiego.gov>; Dana Long <dana.long@sandiego.gov>
Josh Clark (he/him/his)
Senior Active Transportation Planner
619.699.6906 office
411 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101

---

SANDAG office hours are Tuesday – Friday and every other Monday from 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Thomas DeFranco <Thomas.DeFranco@sandag.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 12:22 PM
To: Josh Clark
Subject: FW: SANDAG<>City of San Diego | Draft Mobility Master Plan & Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment Coordination

When: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 3:00 PM-4:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

*Update*: re-scheduling to 2/27 to accommodate schedules

For SANDAG Staff:
City of SD Mobility Master Plan
Hillcrest Specific Plan Amendment

---

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device
Click here to join the meeting

Meeting ID: 241 777 212 649
Passcode: sjrRKU
Download Teams | Join on the web

Or call in (audio only):
+1 619-468-5670,,956005416#
United States, San Diego
Phone Conference ID: 956 005 416#

Learn More | Meeting options
April 29, 2024

Shannon Mulderig
Senior Planner
City Planning Department
City of San Diego

RE: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft March 2024

Dear Ms. Mulderig,

Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO) appreciates the opportunity to offer feedback on the March 2024 Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft, particularly regarding Chapter 5: LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation.

We reiterate concerns previously submitted by SOHO and the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project group, some of which do not appear to have been incorporated into the revised March 2024 Draft. Chapter 5 lacks specific language emphasizing the importance of identifying designated and potential LGBTQ+ historic sites. Although Chapter 6 addresses this, Chapter 5 should also contain such statements to establish a connection between culture and history.

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District should prioritize preserving, maintaining, and promoting local LGBTQ+ history alongside cultural components. Designated historic LGBTQ+ sites must be preserved and incorporated into any new development, as they serve as anchors linking past, present, and future.

Key objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District should acknowledge the significance of social service agencies and community-based organizations, in addition to entertainment and commercial establishments. Recommendations include adding photos and accurately reflecting historically designated sites on maps. Community outreach should encompass Trans, API, Black, BIPOC, and Indigenous communities, ensuring their voices are heard and their history preserved.

Interpretive elements should avoid superficial treatments and instead highlight genuine LGBTQ+ cultural and historic sites. These elements should be integrated with a strong financial-backed maintenance program to prevent deterioration.

The walking corridor and site list should incorporate additional historically significant locations, such as:

- #9 Albert Bell's Residence at 3780-3786 Fifth Avenue should use the official historic designated name: The Center/Gayzette/Albert Bell Building. The San Diego AIDS Project was located at 3777 Fourth Avenue (across the alley from #9 and should be identified.
• The AIDS epidemic in the 1980s established AIDS services at Vauclain Point at the north edge of Front Street (the former site of a SD County facility and later the SD Hospice). That area along with #16 UCSD Owen Clinic has a long history related to AIDS and Hillcrest.
• The Obelisk Bookstore at 1037 University was a landmark bookstore for the LGBTQ+ community.
• The SAGE of California Center at 3138 Fifth Avenue was an important location and drop-in center for lesbians and gay men when it opened in 1999.
• Albert Bell’s final residence at 3815 Vermont Street should be located on the map.
• Contact Lambda Archives for the location of an electrolysis business on University Avenue that served the Trans community.

Policy recommendations include incorporating the stories of marginalized LGBTQ+ communities and explicitly stating the preservation of designated historic LGBTQ+ sites and the identification of potential sites as essential components.

Chapter 6 should accurately reflect designated LGBTQ+ historic sites and work collaboratively with Chapter 5 to preserve and designate LGBTQ+ historic sites.

We do not believe that development by right of historic facades with a 10’ set back should be allowed without further review for contributors to the historic district. Each Historic site may have unique character defining elements and history, which may require different treatments to ensure adequate preservation of these features. This street setback should be 12’ minimum.

Setbacks for towers above 75 ft should be set back 50 feet from the Street. This is what is allowed along “J” street in the ballpark district downtown and it has maintained light and air and allowed a vibrant pedestrian orientated environment. While allowing dense towers appropriate to a modern downtown central business and residential district.

Thank you for reviewing our feedback. Preserving Hillcrest’s LGBTQ+ history is crucial for embracing its past, present, and future identity.

Sincerely,

Bruce Coons
Executive Director
Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO)
Key Questions for the planning department:

1. How were the areas targeted for higher density chosen? What criteria were used?
2. Why were some areas given reduced density targets? (i.e. Mission Hills commercial area)
3. SANDAG plans are not funded and timing is too far out given increasing density in Uptown. What can be done in the plan to provide interim solutions.
4. Are there solutions envisioned for parking?
April 29, 2024

Dear Ms. Corr:

Our LGBTQ+ Cultural District Advisory Group is enthusiastic to continue the dialogue with the City on the creation of an LGBTQ+ Cultural District. We are writing to express our strong support for Plan Hillcrest and share a few small, but important, additional changes for your consideration. We are thankful for the inclusion of the chapter on LGBTQ+ Culture, which was our primary request.

The changes incorporated into the March 2024 Draft reflect our input and set the plan on a positive path to final adoption. With the inclusion of the following minor changes, we think the plan deserves the City Council’s full support.

1. Commercial Activity Area Refinements
   a. Please rename to “Commercial Activity and Entertainment District”. The term “Commercial Activity” does not encompass the many non-commercial special events and activities important to the LGBTQ+ community that occur in Hillcrest such as the Pride Parade. The SDRs associated with the map are designed to protect these uses, not just commercial activity.

   b. Please revise the boundary in Figure 12-1 (see attachment). It should include both present and planned commercial, entertainment, and cultural uses including the LGBTQ+ Arts & Culture Campus, Normal Street Promenade, Pride Parade Staging Area, and LGBTQ+ establishments around University and Third. It must also include residential parcels adjacent to these uses for the noise disclosure in SDR-D.2 to be meaningful and effective.

   c. Correct inadvertent error in all maps showing Harvey Milk St. as Blaine Ave.

   d. Minor adjustments to SDR-D.1 are needed to reflect the unique nature of bars and clubs in LGBTQ+ culture as safe spaces and a place for social gathering and political activism:

      i. Private outdoor patios should be added with the same hours and conditions as sidewalk cafes, streetaries, and active sidewalks.
ii. Add clarification that Process Two Neighborhood Use Permit may be requested to deviate from the standard hours in SDR-D.1.

iii. A kitchen open for meal ordering should not be required, and Type 47 and Type 48 licenses should specifically be listed as an allowed use within the Commercial Activity & Entertainment District.

2. LGBTQ+ Arts & Culture Campus Detail – The redevelopment of the DMV site into an LGBTQ+ Arts and Culture Campus is foundational to the LGBTQ+ Cultural District vision (CD-9). Adjustments to the plan language are needed to carry out this vision and integrate it with AB 1635 introduced by Assemblymember Chris Ward.

   a. Convert the description of the LGBTQ+ Arts & Culture Campus from policy language (CD-9) into a more detailed and enforceable Supplemental Development Regulation. This is essential to ensure the community’s vision is included in the State process and incorporated into development plans.
   
   b. Revise the text in LU-2.17 to allow the relocation of the DMV office from Hillcrest if the State determines during the redevelopment process that this auto-oriented use can be accommodated elsewhere.

3. Certification Program Commitment – The certification program to recognize legacy or anchor LGBTQ+ places and events is important to the community. (EP-2.4.)

   a. We request that in the staff report for the plan, the City commit to a timeline for implementing this program and assign a lead within the appropriate City department.
   
   b. Some businesses in operation less than 30 years are absolute pillars of the LGBTQ+ community that should be protected. Although we appreciate the City’s intent behind the “Legacy Commercial Retail Sales Establishment Protection” (SDR-D.3), we feel this should be removed from the plan so the concept can be further developed together with the certification program.

4. Historic District

   a. The Historic District development regulations shown in graphic format during the planning process do not match the current text. Please conform the text of SDR-C.3 and C.4 to the graphic in Figure 12-4 on page IM-297, which permits structures over 100’. For stepbacks along 4th and 5th Avenues, please consider 20’ for all sites over 25,000 sf and 10’ for sites under 25,000 sf. Setback depth requirements disproportionately impact smaller properties.
b. SDR 1.a requires existing facades and street walls to be preserved, which is a concern for some LGBTQ+ businesses. Please allow greater flexibility such as reconstruction consistent with a building’s historic appearance. This will provide appropriate flexibility in Hillcrest’s evolving commercial core without adversely affecting the special character of the Historic District.

c. Allow 6’ balconies for ADA-accessible design. This is the minimum depth for ADA-accessibility to allow 5’ clear turning width plus a railing. (SDR-C.4.3.)

We appreciate the City Planning Department’s willingness to listen to the LGBTQ+ community and address the issues our group identified through the process. We look forward to adoption of Plan Hillcrest and working with you on carrying out its vision.

Thank you,

Susan Jester (she/her/hers),
Chair of LGBTQ+ Cultural District Advisory Group and San Diego City Commissioner

Jen LaBarbera (they/them),
Interim Co-Executive Director, San Diego Pride

Nicole Verdès (she, they),
Board President, Lambda Archives

Benjamin Nicholls (he/his/him),
Executive Director. Hillcrest Business Association

Kevin Sanders (he/his/him),
Owner, Number 1 on Fifth Avenue

Ryan Bedrosian (he/his/him),
Owner, Rich’s Nightclub

Adam Gilman (he/his/him),
Property Owner

Moe Girton (she/her/hers),
Owner, Gossip Grill

Matt Ramon, (he/his/him),
Owner, Urban MO’s and Inside OUT

Gary Wong (he/his/him), Property Property Owner

Mike Burnett (he/his/him), Owner, Foundation for Form

Jason Frye (he/him/his), Chair, Hillcrest Town Council
May 2, 2024

Shannon Mulderig, Senior Planner
City of San Diego Planning Dept.
9485 Aero Drive, M.S. 413
San Diego, CA 92123
Email: SLMulderig@sandiego.gov
Email: planhillcrest@sandiego.gov

Re: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (Plan Hillcrest)
Draft dated March 2024

Dear Ms. Mulderig:

Mission Hills Heritage is a non-profit organization that focuses on the preservation of the historic resources of Mission Hills, which is part of the greater Uptown neighborhood, and is thereby concerned by planning matters that could adversely affect these precious resources. Because the March 2024 draft of Plan Hillcrest will have significant direct and indirect negative impacts on Mission Hills, we provide this letter in opposition to the plan that details our objections.

Of note, the proposed amendment will allow an additional 19,000 new dwelling units on top of the 11,300 additional units added in the adopted plan less than eight years ago. Given that the City has an approved Housing Element that certifies it has sufficient entitlement capacity for projected household growth at the required affordability levels, it is unclear why this massive increase in density is needed. The increase in the number of residents from 58,870 as envisioned at full build-out under the 2016 adopted plan to 109,800 as envisioned in the proposed amendment, an approximately 87% increase, will have significant negative impacts on Mission Hills. While most of the proposed changes in land use classification are in the Hillcrest neighborhood, two very large parcels in Mission Hills, Vons at 515 W. Washington Street and Lazy Acres at 422 W. Washington Street, would be changed to the newer, Community Commercial designation allowing 0-290 du/ac with a FAR of 8.0.

Negative impacts on Mission Hills include that the proposed dramatic increases in density (up to 210 du/acre in many areas and up to 290 du/acre in some areas) and increased floor area ratios would lead to very tall buildings in blocks adjacent to single family, historic neighborhoods in
Mission Hills, overwhelming the scale and character of the neighborhood. The dramatic increase in residents will significantly increase traffic and impact already tight parking in adjacent areas of Mission Hills and other areas not located within the plan amendment boundary area. Additionally, since the amendment proposes no new parks for tens of thousands of additional residents, the two existing parks located in Mission Hills (Pioneer Park and Presidio Park) will experience severe overuse.

Various other proposed plan changes would also result in negative impacts on Mission Hills and other areas within Uptown not located within the plan amendment boundary area. These impacts include as follows:

1) Proposed deletions of Policies MO-7.13 and MO-7.14 would reduce parking requirements throughout Uptown, adversely affecting the entire community.

2) The removal of the CPIOZ section from Urban Design and complete re-write of such in the Implementation section is vague but would affect the entire area.

3) The removal of Policy UD-4.79, which previously required design to conform to the predominant scale of the neighborhood and be sensitive to the scale of adjacent areas, will result in out-of-scale development adjacent to low-scale areas throughout Uptown.

Finally, as a preservation-focused group, we would be remiss not to note that the proposed Hillcrest Cultural District (Chapter 5) woefully fails to include an objective that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites, and potentially historic sites, should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. The consequence of failing to include such protections threatens to eviscerate the built history of the LGBTQ+ community, which is the necessary anchor of the community’s collective memory and identity.

For the reasons stated above, Mission Hills Heritage opposes the Hillcrest Focus Plan Amendment as proposed in the March 2024 draft.

Sincerely,

Mission Hills Heritage

Kirk Burgamy, President

Cc: Mayor Todd Gloria (MayorToddGloria@sandiego.gov), Seth Litchney, Program Manager, Housing (SALitchney@sandiego.gov), Council President Sean Elo-Rivera (SeanEloRivera@sandiego.gov), Councilmember Stephen Whitburn (StephenWhitburn@sandiego.gov)
Public Facilities, Recreation, Conservation, Noise

- There needs to be more public places included in the plan, but relying on developers to include this in their new developments will only lead to problems and make spaces very piecemeal. The city needs to take some responsibilities that certain spaces be set aside for plazas/piazzas.
- Is there a way to incentivize developers to include green space.
- Need more mini-parks
- With all the high density, where are people going to walk their dogs? There needs to be some green space for them.
- Need to have a dog park. People have to get in their cars to reach the nearest dog park so adding one would help the Climate Action Goals.
- If the Rite Aid property ends up being developed – turn the current parking lot into a green space
- AT&T building - isn’t there someway that the fenced in area be turned into a park? There looks like there’s a park behind the fence.
- What going to be done with Reynard Way Neighborhood Park? This park is so underutilized.
- Elevate the canyon trails in the plan. Better signage.

Noise

- Should allow those club with indoor space be allowed to stay open until 2 AM
RideSD Appreciates the Updated Transit Language in Draft Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment and Makes Final Recommendations

Dear City Planning Department,

RideSD is a grassroots non-profit organization dedicated to educating the public at large on transit and advocating for improvements to our transit infrastructure that will increase ridership.

We are incredibly appreciative of City Planning staff for incorporating RideSD’s initial recommendations into the updated draft of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (FPA). The explicit policies on dedicated transit lanes and clearer language on transit signal priority is great.

The new draft also proposes more dedicated transit lanes. The proposed lanes are fantastic, and RideSD would only like to make the following final recommendations:

- **Complete the Park Boulevard Gap.** Park Boulevard contains dedicated transit lanes for much of its length. However, there is a crucial gap between Upas Street and University Avenue. This gap can cause the bus lane network from Balboa Park to El Cajon Boulevard to fail when we need it the most (e.g., December Nights). RideSD recommends the Hillcrest FPA plan for this gap to be filled.

- **Plan Future Bus Lanes on 4th and 5th Avenues:** The new plan proposes significantly more density in Hillcrest. When combined with the densifying Bankers Hill, and the existing dense Downtown, residents will need an efficient transit option between the three neighborhoods. RideSD recommends that the City plan for a future in which 4th and 5th Avenues have dedicated transit lanes so that residents have that option.

The proposed increase in residential density will help alleviate our housing crisis. However, it’s imperative that density is supported by proven transportation investments like dedicated lanes with transit signal priority. Without this, we risk exacerbating traffic congestion and failing to meet our climate and health goals. Our recommendations also consider those reliant on transit, such as seniors, youth, low-income residents, and the disabled.

Thank you again so much for considering our input in shaping a more transit-friendly and sustainable Hillcrest. Please feel free to contact us at contact@ridesd.org.

Connor Proctor
Vice President
RideSD
The proposed Plan Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Cultural District would be the most effective way of supporting the City of San Diego’s Strategies Plan objective of “Celebrating the cultural diversity and history of the LGBTQ+ community”.

The Cultural District will use effective ways of communicating ideas such as words, written and spoken, pictures and color. It would also include a walking corridor that would link cultural interpretive elements and facilitate walking tours, another effective way to communicate ideas.

Identifying and preserving historic resources and districts on the other hand has proven to not only be ineffective in communicating cultural ideas in San Diego; it has done damage to the city by preventing much needed new multifamily housing, lowering property values, and hurting the city’s tax base.

Society tends to pay for the things that we find work. Most of us learned the main points of history in school, from reading a book or newspaper, or from watching things like a Ken Burns documentary. While we pay teachers, writers, and producers, all City of San Diego, San Diego County, and California state historic buildings lose money; because most people are not interested in spending money on them. Why does the new Hillcrest Plan Amendment propose designating more buildings when people aren’t interested in the ones we already have? What is going on?

The key to understanding Historic Preservation is this Wikipedia entry on the subject. Wikipedia defines Historic Preservation as a “philosophical concept”. The concept/theory was that turning buildings into museums would be a good way to tell history. This theory has been tested in the US for over a hundred years. It was soon evident that it was wrong, that turning buildings into museums is not an effective or popular way to tell history. If you had a restaurant that didn’t have enough customers, it would go out of business; but professional preservationists asked for donations big and small, for volunteers to work for free, and taxpayer money to bail their museums out.

The fact that historically designated buildings are not financially viable became a continuing problem. It was still difficult for professional preservationists to make money. Then about 50 years ago preservationists found that they could make money by getting laws passed that allowed them to get control of other people’s property - without having to compensate the owners financially.

As the chart below from the Wikipedia entry shows, now the majority of jobs in US historic preservation are not in Museums, 9%; but in Regulatory Compliance, 70%. In other words,
managing the laws and regulations that control officially designated or proposed historic properties. The more properties the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board (HRB) designates, either by force of law or because owners want big Mills Act tax subsidies, the more money professional preservationists in San Diego make. Adding more and more proposed properties to community plans is also a way for professional preservationists to make more money.

Appendix E of the Uptown Community Plan lists over 525 Individually and District Designated properties, 17 Potential Historic Districts with some 2678 properties, 4 potential Multi-property Districts with some 953 properties, and 44 Potential Individually Listed properties. If the city already has over 500 designed properties that lower the city’s tax base and the majority of people ignore, why do we need another 3,500 to tell history?

The problem is that the City of San Diego’s historic preservation program is not actually about telling history, supporting the city’s climate action plan, or social equity; it’s about using laws to allow professional preservationists to get control of as much property as possible. The proof is the extremely boring DRAFT Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment LGBTQ+ Historic Context Statement. LGBTQ+ history is actually quite interesting, but that Context Statement isn’t about telling history, it’s about establishing a legal basis for getting control of property that will hold up in court if the city is sued.

To summarize, the majority of Americans do not find historical preservation a good way to learn about history, it is therefore not financially viable; which makes it difficult for professional preservationists to make money. They solved their problem by getting laws passed. Now the overwhelming majority of them make money from taxpayer subsidies and government laws that give them control of other people’s properties without paying for them, not from using buildings to tell history.
Buildings are particularly bad at telling cultural history, even if that was actually the city’s intent. Buildings are just objects that say nothing. They need verbal, written, and/or visual explanations; which are more effective and less expensive than the building itself. The solution is to take all of the proposed historic properties and districts out of the Uptown and Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The proposed Cultural District can talk about culture and history more effectively and for less money than designating buildings. A Cultural District can also evolve over time to keep up with changing needs and new LGBTQ+ history.

Do what is best for the majority of people in San Diego, not what is best for a handful of preservationists. Support the City’s climate action goals, it’s housing needs, and social equity.
Plan Hillcrest Town Hall, April 10 2024

With the city preparing to release an updated draft of the Focused Plan Amendment (aka Plan Hillcrest) to the Uptown Community plan, Vibrant Uptown sponsored a town hall to ensure our neighbors had an opportunity to hear directly from the city and provide feedback on the plan.

Working with co-sponsoring organizations; Hillcrest Town Council, Hillcrest Business Association, Hillcrest all-inclusive Kiwanis, Impulse and the @hillcrestsandiego instagram page we developed a program that was focused on community feedback. We set up six tables in the auditorium at the SAn Diego LGBTQ+ Center auditorium, each dedicated to discussion of one or more chapters from the proposed plan update. Members of our co-sponsoring organizations provided moderators to ensure everyone had a chance to express their opinions with all opinions and points of view welcomed. We were ready to go!

About 80 neighbors came to listen and discuss the planned long term changes to the core of our community, as most of the changes are centered on the urban core of Hillcrest. After words of Welcome from City Councilmember Stephen Whitburn and Hillcrest Business Association president and owner of Rich’s nightclub, Ryan Bedrosian and an update on Vibrant Uptown from Jon Anderson it was time to get down to business. Shannon Corr and Claudia Brizuela went through an overview of the changes proposed and we broke out to the tables to hear from the community. Councilmember Whitburn, Shannon and Claudia from the planning department as well joined in circulating to the tables to answer questions.

The discussions at the various tables were robust. At the tables focused on land use (housing) and mobility large scale maps were provided to provide a visual aid for discussion - and a place
to take notes or make suggestions. Overall, the feedback from those who attended was positive about the direction proposed. Of course there were lots of questions and discussions about alternative approaches, as well as concern over a few areas in the draft.

One of the key questions was trying to understand why some areas were targeted for higher density and others were not. Once these areas were compared with proximity to major employment or retail zones or access to easy transit paths to these areas it became much clearer to all that these changes would help reduce the need for longer commutes, parking for commuters and provide more foot traffic for local retail and entertainment venues. Having most of the density targeted to the urban and commercial core of Uptown was also recognized as a welcome move. There was of course some concern over the potential loss of some older buildings and retailers, but overall the tradeoffs were seen as positive.

As we add more people, in up to 17,000 new homes, it is necessary to look at how people are going to get around. There is little opportunity with the uptown neighborhoods to widen roadways or substantially increase parking to accommodate more personal cars. The mobility table discussed the proposed approach; reduce vehicle miles traveled through changing the existing thoroughfares to accommodate multiple alternate modes, aligned to the city’s general plan mobility element. This involves completion of the cycling infrastructure as well as improving walkability, adding more promenades and improving public transit.

Two mobility concerns rose to the top; safety and the long timelines and unclear funding for transit from SANDAG. Most of the major changes are targeted for 10-30 years out, and participants would like to see more concrete interim steps (park and ride from other neighborhoods, bus service along proposed streetcar and trolley routes, etc.) For safety, increasing numbers of cyclists and pedestrians combined with lax enforcement and speeding traffic are creating demand for more concrete safety changes in Uptown. These include;

- Elimination of right on red along urban corridors
- Reduced speed limits (20 mph)
- Dedicated traffic patrols
- Continental (raised) crosswalks
● Closing key residential street segments to vehicular traffic (5th Ave between Robinson and Washington as an example)
● Narrowing lanes and adding more traffic calming design changes
● What are the plans for bike facilities on University from 1st to the Washington Bridge?
● The proposed class 2 ("sharrows") bike lanes on 6th South of University are completely unacceptable. You have speeding traffic exiting the 163 and a) this traffic needs to be slowed quickly and (b) bicyclists protected.
● The one-way couplets were generally liked, as they have the opportunity to clear traffic waiting for left turns, as long as appropriate calming is provided.

In the discussion of parks and public spaces, a few key topics came to the forefront. The plan proposal requiring promenades and other public spaces to be a requirement of developers as they make changes or redevelop properties is viewed as insufficient at best and likely to fail to realize consistent spaces. The city needs first to develop these places and then ask developers to ADD amenities rather than develop these spaces one piece at a time. Failure to do this will leave long term gaps and discontiguous spaces that are hard to use. Space needs to be envisioned for a dog park. Participants also wanted to see more signage and development of canyon trails and other paths through the neighborhoods.

Businesses, the need for a way to promote and fund innovative startups and new concept prototypes, maybe in a shared location where space can be rented or popups supported? How do we make sure consumers can get to the businesses they wish to access. The conversation on park and ride, a potential short term parking lot in a new commercial building or circulating electric tram service, as well as better (safe) bike parking.

The LGBTQ Cultural District conversation table covered a lot of ground. Key points included;
• Recognition that San Diego’s LGBTQ+ community has evolved and migrated over the years. While it has ended up in Hillcrest today, it has been centered in several other neighborhoods and those should be recognized as well.

• The need for LGBTQ+ themed gathering places other than the bars and nightclubs. While these spaces have been traditional safe spaces for the community many are looking to meet outside of these venues.

• Consider the need for recognition of how the LGBTQ community has contributed to many areas of life; the military, HIV/AIDS, women, BIPOC and trans communities among others

• Preserve affordability for lower income LGBTQ+ community members. It is common for people from small towns or facing challenges at home to move to larger cities to join the communities there. We need to make this move to safe neighborhoods possible.

• Establish a process for the LGBTQ+ community to have an ongoing voice in determining which events, businesses and places are important to the community and how they should be protected and recognized.

Overall, lots of great feedback. We are well on the way to a plan we can all live with and that will help our Uptown communities continue to grow and evolve.

If you have additional feedback or want to see the slides used by the planning department, visit https://planhillcrest.org.
April 28th 2024

Dear Ms Corr,

First and foremost, we would like to express our sincere gratitude and support for the diligent efforts of the planning department staff who have worked tirelessly on this update. It is, without a doubt, a significant step in the right direction. We hereby submit the following comments on the most recent draft for your consideration:

We kindly request that you consider modifying the design of the streets to incorporate Class IV, fully separated bikeways wherever feasible to enhance safety and ensure that we are able to fulfill the city’s Vision Zero commitment. The current plan includes Class II & III bicycle facilities, which we deem insufficient.

We propose expanding the existing dedicated transit lanes outlined in the current draft and converting any peak-only transit lanes to full-time transit-only lanes.

For the numerous streets designated as "2-lane collectors," we respectfully request the inclusion of physical traffic calming measures to prevent excessive speeding. We suggest making all intersections in high or medium pedestrian areas feature elements such as raised crosswalks and speed humps.

We recommend converting "2-lane collector" streets to have a single lane of general traffic to further improve pedestrian and cyclist safety. The reclaimed space could be utilized for dedicated transit, biking, and walking facilities. Although outside of the Plan Hillcrest area, we believe the eastern end of University is a prime candidate for this treatment.

We urge you to take a more proactive approach not only in enhancing pedestrian safety in existing high-traffic walking areas but also in creating and stimulating demand for walking in additional areas by making it safer and more pleasant. Make traffic calming measures a default feature of all streets, not just some of them. This can also include the acceleration of the buildout of promenades, which can be enhanced by developers. Waiting for development, in our opinion, results in fragmented treatments with gaps that may never be entirely filled. Designating these areas in advance with simpler approaches that can be enhanced ensures they are part of a cohesive plan.

The class II bike lanes south of University on 6th Ave are hazardous, according to our assessment, and require revision. With cars exiting the 163 at speeds nearing 50 mph, we believe traffic calming measures and class IV bike facilities are essential in this area.
LGBTQ Cultural District

Moderator & Note Taker: Benny Cartwright

- Naming Hillcrest San Diego’s LGBTQ Cultural District bears a big responsibility to honor San Diego’s greater LGBTQ culture and history.
  - While Hillcrest has been the central point of San Diego’s LGBTQ community since the mid to late 1970s through today, San Diego’s LGBTQ history can be traced back at least a century and it is important to note, celebrate, and honor the spaces throughout the region that the LGBTQ community gathered before Hillcrest.
  - Today, LGBTQ people live in and events take place all over the county as well.
  - How do we honor the entire region’s LGBTQ culture in Hillcrest?
  - "We have a responsibility to engage with the other areas of San Diego County that have an LGBTQ history."

- Hillcrest needs more community gathering spaces.
  - Celebrate the existing murals and create more!
  - Hillcrest does not have a park or community center or recreation center.
    - The San Diego LGBT Community Center is a great space but does not have enough space for many community activities beyond its own services.
  - More public art.
  - Create an “enduring daytime landmark for Hillcrest.”
    - Need more spaces to gather that aren’t bars.
    - A wedding venue!
  - “The relationship of queer life to the public space has changed! In Hillcrest, queerness no longer has to exist only at night, behind closed doors.”

- San Diego’s LGBTQ community members have a number of intersecting experiences that need to be honored and celebrated in a cultural district.
  - LGBTQ military
  - HIV/AIDS community
  - People of color
  - Women
  - Trans/nonbinary communities
  - Binational community: Hillcrest is unique as it is situated about 25 minutes from the US-Mexico border. Many LGBTQ people from Tijuana/Mexico visit Hillcrest regularly.

- Telling the community’s history.
  - Create an integrated queer historical story
  - This is an opportunity to show people that the LGBTQ community’s history is deeper than 1970s nightlife.
  - More history markers at the future Normal Street Promenade.
• LGBTQ people moving out
  ○ Changes to the community - primarily new development and pricey rents/home prices are pushing many LGBTQ people out of Hillcrest.
  ○ How do we maintain Hillcrest as the center of San Diego’s LGBTQ life into the future, even if LGBTQ people become a minority in the neighborhood?
  ○ Hillcrest needs to remain safe for LGBTQ people.
  ○ LGBTQ nightlife is rapidly changing - more and more non-LGBTQ people now partaking in LGBTQ nightlife and not always respecting the sanctity/safety of these spaces.
  ○ Could “queer rules”/”how to be a good ally” be integrated into historical markers?
  ○ Create more low-income/affordable housing in Hillcrest!
  ○ Increasing the housing supply is VERY GOOD! It will lower the cost of older housing as the supply increases. Unfortunately, the new luxury housing stock being built in Hillcrest is displacing LGBTQ people - need to keep an eye on this!

• Legacy Program
  ○ Instead of 30-year no matter what kind of business, LGBTQ establishments can be voted in after a certain time. Must be nominated by community, community leadership, city council, etc.
Please include in the plan a call to one day build a cap over the 163 freeway to allow for the addition of retail, park, and/or residential spaces. We believe this could be particularly effective at University Avenue, where a cap similar to the one at Union Station in Ohio would restore the continuity of storefronts along the avenue. This approach would activate the space by dramatically enhancing the pedestrian experience, making it more pleasant and inviting for people to walk and shop along University Avenue. Furthermore, the creation of commercial spaces on the sides of the cap would provide an opportunity to fund the construction, as the income generated from these spaces could help offset the costs. The Cap at Union Station in Ohio serves as an excellent example of the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of such a project, with a construction cost of only $10M. See more details on the project here.

Photo showing the completed version of The Cap at Union Station

We support the conversion of Robinson and University into one-way systems on the narrower east end. However, this must be accompanied by adequate traffic calming measures, such as raised continental crosswalks and other traffic calming approaches, to prevent increased traffic speeds.

We fully support the LGBTQ+ cultural district plan, including the emphasis on celebrating events over preserving buildings. Our history deserves to be celebrated in Hillcrest and other parts of the city where LGBTQ events took place. These places, people, and events hold more significance to us than buildings that may be preserved merely due to their age or because they were the available spaces for gathering at the time.

We believe that branding and wayfinding around the key places and event markers celebrating LGBTQ history is crucial in establishing and honoring the cultural history of Hillcrest and Uptown as a unique part of San Diego's heritage.
It is our firm belief that the LGBTQ cultural district must be guided by a group of LGBTQ citizens, selected by and for the community. This should include not only familiar faces but also the new, younger faces who are propelling the community forward.

Countless LGBTQ youth flock to large cities like San Diego to escape repression and rejection from their families. They desire to settle in and around the heart of LGBTQ life in areas like Hillcrest. We believe that the current lack of affordable housing set aside to welcome and protect these youth must be addressed to ensure that there is always a welcoming space for them to settle, discover themselves, and contribute to the vibrant community here.

We wholeheartedly agree with the idea of eliminating blank walls and activating new buildings with retail, public areas – including open rooftops for fresh air and views – and a distinctive neighborhood look and feel. This includes the amenities that, in our opinion, make people want to utilize them: restrooms, public Wi-Fi, access to water, and quiet seating protected from high-speed traffic noise.

We look forward to continuing this conversation as the plan moves through the committee hearings and the next draft is released. In the meantime, please keep up the fantastic work you’ve been doing - we truly appreciate all your efforts!

Best,

Jon Anderson

Vibrant Uptown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Method of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Upzone Mission Hill, They contribute least tax/acre for you.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Add Transit/Bike map to the zoning map.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Upzone Mission Hills</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Need mixed use in this area, lack of resturaants and corner stores, (pointing to space around medical center at Albatross and Front Street)</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>This Area is open space. Could take way ___ density.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Arbor Drive + 4th Avenue Currently medium desnity: Signle Family. &quot;Condos... need density&quot;</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>New Appartments</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>mixed use around normal street and prommenade</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>mixed use around normal street and prommenade</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Hillcrest is a fabulous neighborhood, and I’d love to see more people living there and enjoying the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>mixed on 6th</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Affordable housing using state funds for seniors.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>need to have opportunities for design review; CPG needs to organize feedback venues/ cadences for community input on development.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Designated Advertisement Spaces - posters are all over the place - This will cause less congestion on sidewalks.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Urban Design, Public Services</td>
<td>shaded spaces, heating and water stations, more benches, and public restrooms.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Urban Design, Public Services</td>
<td>Need to start funding more streetlights - 550m</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>backlog on street lights: saftey issue</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conservation, Implementation</td>
<td>is there any reason to remove trees in the first place on sites that remove trees.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Community fridges, providing food to the low income after pantry's are closed.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Trash containers, inclusion of dog waste bags</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>fine people who own plots of land who don't use them for a number of years - vacancy tax</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Is the rite aid site set to become a community plaza? On robinson and sixth, seen on private contractor post on social media, this ln regards to development on sixth going south toward balboa on left side.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>enforce murals on existing buildings like the walls on the At&amp;T building</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Implementation, Recreation</td>
<td>question about trees - Developers build new sidewalks near establishments importing trees helps with green space on sidewalks if trees are removed what is the plan to replace trees if removed on sites for re-development</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>2 Past Program for leg. Bus</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LGBT Qualifier</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Entertainment District signals to new residents + developers</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Allowing businesses to stay open. Cafes is good.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Synergy: Co-location of similar business</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Local vs Large Corporations, Businesses -&gt; unique restrictions, sq. footage vs parking what businesses will exist in this area, How do we know if they will guarantee</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Implementation?</td>
<td>ex. Gossip Grill (Lesbian establishments keep green space promenades) could we ask for the commercial?</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>how were the areas targeted for higher density chosen? What criteria were used?</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Why were some areas given reduced density targets? (i.e. Mission Hills commercial area).</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>SANDAG Plans are not funded and timing is too far out given increasing density in uptown. What can be done in the plan to provide interim solutions.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Are there solutions envisioned for parking?</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Recreation, Land Use, Implementation</td>
<td>There needs to be more public places included in the plan, but relying on developers to include this in their new developments will only lead to problems and make spaces very piecemeal. The city needs to take some responsibilities that certain spaces be set aside for plazas/piazzas</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Is there a way to incentivize developers to include green space.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Need more mini-parks</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>With all the high density, where are people going to walk their dogs? There needs to be some green space for them.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Need to have a dog park. People have to get in their cars to reach the nearest dog park so adding one would help the Climate Action Goals.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Recreation, Land Use</td>
<td>If the Rite Aid property ends up being developed – turn the current parking lot into a green space</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Recreation, Land Use</td>
<td>AT&amp;T building - isn’t there someway that the fenced in area be turned into a park? There looks like there’s a park behind the fence.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>What going to be done with Reynard Way Neighborhood Park? This park is so underutilized.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Elevate the canyon trails in the plan. Better signage.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Recreation, Implementation</td>
<td>Should allow those club with indoor space be allowed to stay open until 2 AM</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Mobility, Implementation</td>
<td>As we add more people, in up to 17,000 new homes, it is necessary to look at how people are going to get around. There is little opportunity with the uptown neighborhoods to widen roadways or substantially increase parking to accommodate more personal cars. The mobility table discussed the proposed approach; reduce vehicle miles traveled through changing the existing thoroughfares to accommodate multiple alternate modes, aligned to the city’s general plan mobility element. This involves completion of the cycling infrastructure as well as improving walkability, adding more promenades and improving public transit.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>workshop_Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two mobility concerns rose to the top; safety and the long timelines and unclear funding for transit from SANDAG. Most of the major changes are targeted for 10-30 years out, and participants would like to see more concrete interim steps (park and ride from other neighborhoods, bus service along proposed streetcar and trolley routes, etc.) For safety, increasing numbers of cyclists and pedestrians combined with lax enforcement and speeding traffic are creating demand for more concrete safety changes in Uptown. These include:

- Elimination of right on red along urban corridors
- Reduced speed limits (20 mph)
- Dedicated traffic patrols
- Continental (raised) crosswalks
- Closing key residential street segments to vehicular traffic (5th Ave between Robinson and Washington as an example)
- Narrowing lanes and other traffic calming design changes
- What are the plans for bike facilities on University from 1st to the Washington bridge?
- The proposed class 2 (“sharrows”) bike lanes on 6th south of University are completely unacceptable. You have speeding traffic exiting the 163 and a) this traffic needs to be slowed quickly and (b) bicyclists protected.
- The one way couplets were generally liked, as they have the opportunity to clear traffic waiting for left turns, as long as appropriate calming is provided.
<p>| 49 | Recreation | In the discussion of parks and public spaces, a few key topics came to the forefront. The plan proposal requiring promenades and other public spaces to be a requirement of developers as they make changes or redevelop properties is viewed as insufficient at best and likely to fail to realize consistent spaces. The city needs first to develop these paces and then ask developers to ADD amenities rather than develop these spaces one piece at a time. Failure to do this will leave long term gaps and discontinuous spaces that are hard to use. Space needs to be envisioned for a dog park. Participants also wanted to see more signage and development of canyon trails and other paths through the neighborhoods. | Vibrant Uptown | workshop_document |
| 50 | Urban Design? | Businesses, the need for a way to promote and fund innovative startups and new concept prototypes, maybe in a shared location where space can be rented or popups supported? How do we make sure consumers can get to the businesses they wish to access. The conversation on park and ride, a potential short term parking lot in a new commercial building or circulating electric tram service, as well as better (safe) bike parking. | Vibrant Uptown | workshop_document |
| 51 | Urban Design?, Recreation | Public spaces changing patio space easement changes the game and the parking = social space. i.e. parking lane change | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 52 | Economic Prosperity | economic development to assist | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 53 | Economic Prosperity | hillcrest can be a commercial place not just for hospitality, but also normal street promenade has a part of the project is natural. | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 54 | Land Use | Medium hub doesn’t need to be bumping (Loud Music) | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 55 | Land Use | Housing parking (paying for that) | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 56 | Land Use | Q: is entitlement to parking a generational? | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 57 | Implementation | permit parking not just meter or | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 58 | Public Services | maintenance assessment district, Clean + safe program, helping the people (critical) needs met | Vibrant Uptown | workshop |
| 59 | Conservation | Private entities need to pool resources, i.e. arborists | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 60 | Land Use, Urban Design | sq footage for developer creating variety of space built for a VARIETY of businesses, ie startup small businesses vs big businesses | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 61 | Urban Design? | Small business Networking | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 62 | Urban Design, Economic Prosperity | Laurence furniture ex. Boya’s space - safe space offer tailoring in store offering an experience online shift during the pandemic, but not everything can be done virtually. | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 63 | ? | Vertigo movie | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 64 | Urban Design, Land Use | take-out &amp; pickup for businesses like even dry cleaning or tailoring | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 65 | Urban Design | Accessibility | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 66 | Economic Prosperity | What is the definition of commercial zone, -economic hub needs a variety of business, prototyping, not just hospitality | Vibrant Uptown workshop |
| 67 | Urban Design, Implementation | Design -&gt; we used to have design review, iterative review, community would coach; this no longer happens; ministerial review isn’t working, *we need to see what is being proposed. | Vibrant Uptown notecards |
| 68 | Urban Design | need a plaza, when parcel is developed, the need to prioritized. *need to push as CPG | Vibrant Uptown notecards |
| 69 | Implementation | Create an incentive/ disincentive for vacant lots. A lot of vacant lots in the area. | Vibrant Uptown notecards |
| 70 | Economic Prosperity | special exemptions, allowances, or benefits for shopkeeper units. Commercial space w/ residential unit, Create Local economy &amp; community HOUSING AND ECON PROSPERITY | Vibrant Uptown notecards |
| 71 | Economic Prosperity | Create zoning code for exclusively live/work artist residences (see: LA examples) [ECON PROSPERITY, HOUSING, LGBTQ CULTURE] | Vibrant Uptown notecards |
| 72 | Economic Prosperity | Reduce Parking. Biggest Misconception for business prosperity is “more parking” Increase bus &amp; trolley access to business Activity District. | Vibrant Uptown notecards |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>University and Washington Bridges over the 163. Add extension platforms to bridge (Desk?) to increase pedestrian and bike space or elevated sidewalks on each side.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Mixed use should include Residential above a diversity of business types: Retail, Entertainment, Office, Hospitality, Light/minor Industrial, Health</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Highest Density should allow for multi-level commercial mixed-use, (diagram doodle of 6 story building, floor 1&amp;2 commercial, 4+ Residential)</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Restrict vehicular traffic on anchor streets. Vehicles are too noisy, dangerous, inefficient</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Trolley Line going through anchor streets. (University Ave, Washington, Park Blvd).</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mobility, Implementation</td>
<td>Existing sidewalks need to be widened, wider sidewalks on anchor streets. (university, washington, 6th ave, Park Blvd).</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>PLAN HILLCREST - MOBILITY: Class 4 bike lanes should be protected all the way up to the intersection. Eliminate right yirn on red - which is very dangerous.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>PLAN HILLCREST - MOBILITY: What safe bike connections are planned for W. University Ave? The bike lanes that stop @ 1st Ave in the plan dump bikes into dangerous sharrows. We need safe connections to the Trolley!!!</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>PLAN HILLCREST - MOBILITY: I question the designation of Robinson Ave across the 163 &amp; between the 163 &amp; Park as &quot;Low Stress&quot; for bikes without bike lanes.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Development maps w/ rendering; access to plans. * Is there concern for design, can we have machinisms for community planning?</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Public Spaces cannot be duel in parcel as development occurs. Need for cohesive development</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mobility, Implementation</td>
<td>If you want high quality bike lanes, you need to enforce bike lanes. (SDPD will never do it). Provide more shade for pedestrians. (eg: trees and shade covers).</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown</td>
<td>notecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mobility, Implementation</td>
<td>Buses should be adjacent to trains. Elderly and Disabled need more time to board. Trains will serve for quicker access.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Accessible housing with access for disability and senior living, safe walking for disability person.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>What is the possibility of a central parking garage?</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>With the FPA adding significant higher residential density combined with bonkers will high density residential. And the already high density residential density in _____It can be expected that 4th and 5th will have high levels of Can the City plan for FUTURE dedicated transit lanes on 4th and 5th? This will provide a reliable and efficient connection between the three communities.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Transit Priority, - dedicated bus lanes achieve CAP goals, - transit should compete with cars on travel times.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown notecards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>safer trolley connections</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>extend 1-way from 1st to washington for Class IV bikeway</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Close eastbound ramp from washington onto university to traffic to create a dedicated bike lane to hillcrest. Westbound ramp would be used to accomodate oneway traffic on university.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Greater ped; bike connections across Washington</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Pedestrian scramble crosswalks</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>5th avenue pedestrian promenade b/w university + robinson</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>6th avenue should not have Sharrows per NACTO!</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Pedestrian refuge across university. *uni x vermont to access grocery stores</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Replace RFBs with Hawk beacon at Uni + Center</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Bus lanes on 5th and 4th for faster service to downtown and bankers hill</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Make street car grade separated light rail</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Metro network, not a streetcar loop</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>163 should in the (near) future become a ped/bike/transit rail.</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Class IV bikeways protected by planters w/ CA native flowers</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Future bike lanes on 4th and 5th should be planned!</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>I &lt;3 dedicated transit facilities!</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Hillcrest needs more community gathering spaces. Celebrate the existing murals and create more! Hillcrest does not have a park or community center or recreation center. The San Diego LGBT Community Center is a great space but does not have enough space for many community activities beyond its own services. More public art. Create an “enduring daytime landmark for Hillcrest.” Need more spaces to gather that aren’t bars. A wedding venue! “The relationship of queer life to the public space has changed! In Hillcrest, queerness no longer has to exist only at night, behind closed doors.”</td>
<td>Vibrant Uptown workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vibrant Uptown workshop
San Diego’s LGBTQ community members have a number of intersecting experiences that need to be honored and celebrated in a cultural district.

- LGBTQ military
- HIV/AIDS community
- People of color
- Women
- Trans/nonbinary communities

Binational community: Hillcrest is unique as it is situated about 25 minutes from the US-Mexico border. Many LGBTQ people from Tijuana/Mexico visit Hillcrest regularly.

Telling the community’s history.

Create an integrated queer historical story

This is an opportunity to show people that the LGBTQ community's history is deeper than 1970s nightlife.

More history markers at the future Normal Street Promenade.
| 109 Implementation | LGBTQ people moving out Changes to the community - primarily new development and pricey rents/home prices are pushing many LGBTQ people out of Hillcrest. How do we maintain Hillcrest as the center of San Diego’s LGBTQ life into the future, even if LGBTQ people become a minority in the neighborhood? Hillcrest needs to remain safe for LGBTQ people. LGBTQ nightlife is rapidly changing - more and more non-LGBTQ people now partaking in LGBTQ nightlife and not always respecting the sanctity/safety of these spaces. Could “queer rules”/“how to be a good ally” be integrated into historical markers? Create more low-income/affordable housing in Hillcrest! Increasing the housing supply is VERY GOOD! It will lower the cost of older housing as the supply increases. Unfortunately, the new luxury housing stock being built in Hillcrest is displacing LGBTQ people - need to keep an eye on this! | Vibrant Uptown workshop_Document |
| 110 Implementation | Legacy Program Instead of 30-year no matter what kind of business, LGBTQ establishments can be voted in after a certain time. Must be nominated by community, community leadership, city council, etc. | Vibrant Uptown workshop_Document |
Friday, May 10, 2024

Shannon Corr
City of San Diego Planning Department
202 C Street, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Response

Hello Shannon

Please find attached the motion passed by Uptown Planners at its May 7, 2024, meeting regarding the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstentions. The motion disapproves the Plan Amendment and states the rationale.

I am also attaching certain requests for consideration.

Please thank Coby Tomlins, Phil Trom and Shelby Buso of the Planning Department for attending the meeting and for responding to the numerous, and varied, questions and comments.

We look forward to working with you revising the plan.

Please contact me with any questions which you may have.

Sincerely,

UPTOWN PLANNERS, A CPG

JAMES R. WALSH, CHAIR

Copy: Mayor Todd Gloria
Coby Tomlins

Councilmember Stephen Whitburn
San Diego Planning Commission
MOTION

The Chair of Uptown Planners should advise the Planning Department, the City Council, and the Mayor that our CPG cannot approve the current draft of the Planning Department’s proposed “Plan Hillcrest Focused Amendment” to the Uptown Community Plan.

Uptown Planners favors responsible development and supports the ostensible goals of Plan Hillcrest, especially celebrating the legacy of our LGBTQ+ community. However, the board is withholding approval of the proposed amendment itself, which would affect all of Uptown, because of significant community concerns about major and potentially transformative elements of the proposal. Our CPG’s concerns (summarized below) have been repeatedly raised to the Planning Department without adequate response. The document attached titled “Plan Hillcrest Requests” provides the history of our attempted constructive engagement and details our specific requests.

The board also directs its Operations & Outreach Committee to take steps to engage the community about the concerns summarized below and to work with the board Chair in preparing materials, if/as appropriate, for presentations of the board’s position at meetings of the Planning Commission, City Council, and possibly other local groups.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS

Mobility: The proposed one-way couplet on Robinson & University, along with the plan for a combined bus lane/emergency vehicle lane on Washington Street and reduced vehicle lanes and parking on these three sole east-west through streets, would increase congestion in an already congested area. The negative effects would extend beyond Hillcrest businesses and residents to businesses and residents throughout Uptown, as well as to traffic on Highway 163. Neither SANDAG public transportation plans nor the city’s own Mobility Technical Report support the effectiveness of these radical changes in either the short-term or the long-term. In fact, the Mobility Technical Report shows that existing high traffic streets and intersections already earn failing grades, with no projected improvements.

Density: Adding to concerns about increased congestion is the proposed extended size of the area in which high-density building would be allowed. Changes in zoning would lead to buildings up to over twice the maximum height already allowed. This could result in tens of thousands more Uptown residents than our current community plan already provides for, growth which would far exceed what current SANDAG predictions justify.

Infrastructure: Added density, in turn, would require improvements to infrastructure for safety services, public utilities, recreation centers, green spaces, and other basic community needs that are not being proposed or adequately considered. Uptown already has a deficit of parks and other public facilities. The proposal also would not adequately protect historic resources, including those related to LGBTQ+ history. All of these problems would negatively affect the well-being of everyone in Uptown, especially its most vulnerable citizens.

Gentrification: The proposal’s reduced mobility, increased permitted density, and failure to require sufficient infrastructure could gentrify Uptown into another (and less desirable) downtown. This not only would not materially address the city’s housing affordability crisis but quite possibly might worsen it due to the loss of naturally occurring affordable housing and increased land values. Increased land values also could impact existing local businesses, with new, expensive mixed-use construction driving up rents. Finally, despite Uptown’s sizeable population of the unhoused and housing insecure, the proposal includes no provisions to subsidize or even encourage substantial development of truly affordable housing.
PLAN HILLCREST REQUESTS BY UPTOWN PLANNERS FOR CONSIDERATION, APPROVED 5/7/24
REGARDING THE “HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT DRAFT” RELEASED ON 3/14/24

BACKGROUND

On 11/5/19, Uptown Planners was informed by the Planning Department that “recommendations for Hillcrest Focused Plan (amendments to the Community Plan) could be made through a sitting subcommittee or an ad hoc subcommittee could be created for this purpose. The effort would be completed by mid-2022. SB 2 transportation funding requires a quick timeline.”

On 4/28/20, the Planning Department hosted its first webinar presenting its conception of Plan Hillcrest. Despite what was represented, the changes first proposed were never materially altered.

On 10/6/23, the Planning Department released its first Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Draft, which finally provided specifics, along with a notice that the deadline to submit comments on it would be 11/17/23.

On 11/15/23, Uptown Planners submitted a letter to the City approved by unanimous vote on 11/7/23. [Attachment A.] It detailed the history of this amendment process, calling attention to the perfunctory and superficial nature of the Planning Department’s consideration of our input as the officially recognized community planning group and its dismissal of our requests for adequate time to review completed documents.

On 12/6/23, after having its requests for extension denied yet again, Uptown Planners voted unanimously to approve another letter to the City [Attachment B.] with specific recommendations. These are reorganized sequentially and by element and incorporated in these requests and identified by “Draft01”.

On 3/14/24, the Planning Department released its second Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment draft, along with a notice that the deadline to submit comments would be 4/29/24. Despite our requests for the same amount of additional time to review granted other community planning groups going through this same process, we were only allowed until our next regular meeting on 5/7/24.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The specific recommendations that follow identify the draft policies and goals that we have identified in our public outreach as needing revision, reinforcement or repeal. But they speak to four overall observations that summarize our community’s concerns:

1) Mobility is speculative.

Transportation must come first, but instead it is an afterthought and dependent on outside agencies and private employers that are not obligated to accommodate the City’s wishes. This amendment presupposes built environment and transit routes that the City admits may not exist until 2050 (if ever) to justify the changes it compels by 2035. The Mobility Element upends the actual priority of different modes without factual
basis, privileging the non-disabled while failing to meet, per the Plan Hillcrest Mobility Technical Report, proven level of service and vehicle parking standards by forfeiting existing access with no concern for mitigation.

2) **Density is disproportionate and inappropriate.**

The entirely new zoning designations of CC-3-10 and CC-3-11, and new introduction of RM-4-11, would increase the density allowances of Hillcrest by 100% and 137% beyond the current maximum. This would more than what is allowed in Downtown — yet they are being applied to over half the amendment area. Further, the existing 2016 Community Plan already permits over 50% more dwelling units for a 60% population increase for all of Uptown, while SANDAG projects only 0.17% population growth per year for all of the City of San Diego by 2050.

3) **Recreation, Public/Safety Facilities and Historic Preservation are deficient.**

Hillcrest is the only one of the six neighborhoods in Uptown without a park or open space of any kind, yet neither draft plans for either while seeking to double the current population. Likewise, there is no procedure for where or when to provide for additional public safety and amenities beyond what currently exists. And there is no contingency should the now, reduced-in-size proposed LGBTQ+ historic district not proceed — unlike the new, commerce-centered “cultural district” introduced in the most recent draft.

4) **Land value capture is nonexistent.**

One of the main goals of Plan Hillcrest is to “affirmatively further fair housing.” Yet the blanket upzoning proposed would instantly double existing land values with no requirements to construct new affordable or to preserve naturally occurring affordable housing — or to alleviate the knock-on effects from increased rents and purchase prices. And there are no mechanisms to claw back the automatic added land worth created to pay for the added strains on existing infrastructure or for anything else. There is zero public benefit to offset the private profit siphoned from the commons.

**REQUESTS FOR CHANGES TO THE SECOND DRAFT, RELEASED 3/14/24**

- Throughout. Eliminate or define planning specialist jargon/acronyms and double-speak, including, but not limited to, these examples: “path to narrative,” VMF, “woonerf principles” “auxiliary pedestrian facility,” “non-traditional parks,” “urban parkways,” etc. [Draft01]
- Throughout. Identify how changes to the community might affect its homeless population and associated issues with public safety, public health, impacts on tourism and local businesses, etc. [Draft01]
- Page I.: Change the name of the document to “2024 Update to the Uptown Community Plan” (reflecting that numerous and substantive changes proposed would not affect only the Hillcrest neighborhood). [Draft01]
- Page IN-2. “[A] key objective of the Urban Design Element is to protect and enhance the qualities that make these neighborhoods unique.” Fail to see any follow through in the draft plans on this.
• Page IN-6. The gratuitous insertion of the words 'high density' to describe the existing mixed-use buildings is biased toward incompatible new development and should be removed.

• Page IN-7. "Hillcrest is the crossroads of Uptown, with major streets intersecting in Hillcrest's core." The Mobility Element needs to realistically account for this.

• Page IN-11. "The [Uptown] community is estimated to have a future population of 109,800 people and 52,800 dwelling units at the build-out of the Community Plan." There is no citation or objective basis for these figures, which instead represent the preconceived objectives of the Plan Hillcrest funding, and therefore they need to be corrected to reflect actual SANDAG projections.

• Page IN-14. The statement, "By increasing transportation choices, a reduction in overall vehicle miles traveled can be achieved." There is no substantiation or evidence provided to support this claim — and is directly contradicted by the retraction of "VMT-efficient areas" made on Page PF-162.

• Page IN-14. Restore the stricken out "General Plan Guiding Principles."

Land Use Element

• Throughout. Lower the density included in the plan overall, and base population planning projections on current SANDAG projections, identifying those in the plan, and also addressing demographic assumptions. [Draft01]

• Throughout. Plan for possible effects upon the community of potential changes to major properties affecting land use, including DMV's possible move, SDUSD's repurposing of its Normal Street administration building, closure of the University Heights Library, expansion and rebuilding plans of both UCSD and Scripps. [Draft01]

• Throughout. Include a plan for augmentation and maintenance of infrastructure, including public utilities (water, sewer, lighting, road surfacing, etc.), police/fire facilities, libraries, etc. [Draft01]

• Page LU-24. Create a table (comparable to Table 2.2) showing projected land use in 2050. [Draft01]

• Page LU-25, the gratuitous insertion of the word "very" to describe the existing density is biased toward incompatible new development and should be removed.

• Pages LU-27 through LU-37 and throughout. Update and/or expand maps to improve legibility and level of detail. Also revise legends and color markings to be clear, accurate, and complete, with no extraneous elements. [Draft01]

• Page LU-29, LU-38 and throughout. Remove the newly introduced zone RM-4-11. The maximum density for should be RM-4-10 introduced in the 2016 Plan, an existing zoning designation that already is "very high density." The Floor to Area Ratio should be no higher than 3.6, with building heights capped at 11 stories with Dwelling Units per Acre capped at 109. This maximum density zoning should not be in the Hillcrest core but only allowed on major transit corridors.
within a half-mile walk on existing sidewalks from a public transit stop, such as Park Blvd and El Cajon Blvd.

- Page LU-29, LU-40 and throughout. Remove the newly created zones CC-3-10 and CC-3-11. The maximum density for should be CC-3-9, an existing zoning designation that already is "very high density." The Floor to Area Ratio should be no higher than 8, with building heights capped at 11 stories with Dwelling Units per Acre capped at 109. This maximum density zoning should not be in the Hillcrest core but only allowed on major transit corridors within a half-mile walk on existing sidewalks from a public transit stop, such as Park Blvd and El Cajon Blvd. [Draft01]

- Page LU-43. The gratuitous insertion of the word "very" to describe the existing density is biased toward incompatible new development and should be removed.

- Page LU-45. Include a plan for development of non-entertainment and specialty retail businesses that would be required to support increased population density, including additional grocery shopping. [Draft01]

- Pages LU-48 through LU-51. The gratuitous replacement of the words "community" and "neighborhood" with "urban" to describe existing conditions is biased toward incompatible new development and should be removed.

Mobility Element

- Page MO-55. Restore the phrase "for vehicular traffic" to the end of the sentence "Adequate capacity and improved regional access..."

- Page MO-65. Address ways of encouraging bicycle usage (especially for commuting) in addition to installation of dedicated bicycle lanes (lockers; charging for electric bikes; safety education and signage; employer, business, and residential bike accommodations, etc.). [Draft01]

- Pages MO-66 through MO-71 and throughout. In all cases where proposed public transit routes and transit facilities have not been implemented, zoning and other changes proposed in those areas may not be implemented.

- Pages MO-66 through MO-71 and throughout. Remove the proposal to create a commuter rail line through Florence Canyon, which is designated Open Space, and also the proposal for a skyway. [Draft01]


- Page MO-71 and throughout. Eliminate the plan to designate any portion of either Robinson Avenue or University Avenue as one-way and provide specificity about location and nature of proposed traffic calming elements. [Draft01]

- Page MO-82. Reinstall policies MO-7.13 and MO-7.14 ("Provide on-street parking on all streets to support adjacent uses and enhance pedestrian safety."). [Draft01]
Urban Design Element

- Throughout. Address the accessibility of public amenities, including new streetscaping, and how accessibility would be impacted during development and with restricted parking. [Draft01]

- Page UD-85 and throughout. The gratuitous replacement of the words “community” and “neighborhood” with “urban” to describe existing conditions is biased toward incompatible new development and should be removed.

- Page UD-97. Include drinking fountains and public restrooms in the Streetscape policies.

- Pages UD-101 and UD-102. The redefinition of avenues as “major connectors,” and the inclusion of University Ave and Robinson Ave in the previously identified list of the four north-south avenues, is a semantic sleight of hand that obscures the unsupported claim that one-way traffic flow automatically increases volume. As such, the original 2016 Community Plan language should be restored.

- Page UD-111. Strengthen the language to “retain and utilize” mature and healthy street trees and strike “when feasible” in UD-3.62.

- Page UD-119. The addition of promenades is used specifically to validate the elimination of a public park/greenway for Hillcrest originally proposed in the 1988 Community Plan. As Hillcrest is the only Uptown neighborhood without a park, we object to defining this away from consideration and reject the argument that a public park/greenway for this space would be incompatible with current uses.

- Page UD-129. Reinstall policy UD-4.79 (“Design to conform to the predominant scale of the neighborhood and/or particular block and be sensitive to adjacent uses.”). [Draft01]

- Pages UD-129 through UD-132. Reinstall the 2016 Community Plan language and figures regarding development transitions and transition plane guidelines.

LGBTQ+ Cultural Element

- Page LC-150. Include in Policy 5.6 language to establish a core LGBTQ+ historic district, and center it as essential to the LGBTQ+ cultural district.

- Page LC-150. The only organization identified by name as being involved in the formation of an LGBTQ+ cultural district is the Hillcrest Business Association — which is not an LGBTQ+ organization. The term “business groups” already used is sufficient and respects that there are other, specifically LGBTQ+ focused business groups, such as the San Diego Equality Business Alliance.

Economic Prosperity Element

- Throughout. Identify ways to encourage economic prosperity and small business development, including how to support continuance of existing commercial businesses during growth and change. [Draft01]

- Page EP-157. Add realistic parking requirements so sufficient free and low-cost parking will be available both to patrons of local businesses and to residents.
(existing and new), including planning for a public parking garage in or near the Hillcrest core. [Draft01]

Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element

- Page PF-165. Include a plan for funding Capital Improvement Projects now that DIFs do not need to be spent where collected, identifying how, when “engaging the community,” Uptown Planners will have a specific, substantial, supportive, and collaborative [role] in determining CIPs for Uptown. [Draft01]

- Page PF-170. Strike the words “to the Teachers Training Annex at the San Diego Unified School District’s Education Center should the property become available” from PF-1.8, to recognize that the relocation of the University Heights Branch Library is necessary by itself and is not dependent on this option.

Recreation Element

- Page RE-175 and throughout. Eliminate controversial and/or political language that gratuitously promotes current City administration policies, such as claiming that the revised Parks Plan will “benefit” Uptown. [Draft01]

- Page RE-186. The change to a meaningless “-7,581 recreation value points” to classify park deficiencies in place of the concrete “park deficit of 94.17 acres” needs to be reversed. And given that there are 380 total acres being considered under the plan amendment, this situation merits higher priority.

- Page RE-190. Plan for parks and other substantially-sized public spaces (outside of existing canyons), including playgrounds, potential joint use opportunities with SDUSD properties/facilities, recreational center, playing fields, etc. [Draft01]

- Page RE-193. Do more than “evaluate utilization of paper streets as future park and open space opportunities,” by proactively designating these City assets as recreational “infill,” to redress the park deficit and halt the piecemeal vacation of these parcels for private development.

Conservation Element

- Page CE-197. Restore the deleted language, “Adaptive reuse of older structures is not only energy efficient, but also helps maintain the community’s neighborhood character.”

- Page CE-199. Include a policy that recognizes the embodied carbon from construction activities and not just the operational carbon of completed structures in evaluating sustainable development practices.

- Page CE-199. Prioritize the maintenance and/or production of affordable housing, including on-site requirements, along with middle income and family housing. [Draft01]

- Page CE-199. Identify the percentage of Hillcrest and of District that currently is concrete and also the projected percentage of both that would be concrete in 2050, based upon the Planning Department’s proposal. [Draft01]
• Page CE-207. Include a plan for increasing tree canopy and protecting existing mature trees. [Draft01]

Noise Element
• Page NE-211. Address how noise ordinance exemptions and new noise noticing will be monitored and enforced. [Draft01]

Historic Preservation Element
• Pages HP-233 through HP-235. Identify ways to avoid gentrification and changes to historical diversity because of class-based redlining and building of residences not affordable for populations that currently or potentially live and work in Hillcrest. [Draft01]
• Pages HP-233 and HP-234. Prioritize maintenance and/or production of single family or duplex starter homes and individual property ownership, maximizing opportunities for members of historically underserved or marginalized groups to have the opportunity to establish generational wealth. [Draft01]
• Pages HP-233 and HP-234. Address opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing building stock (both commercial and residential) and the preservation of existing SROs and Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing. [Draft01]
• Pages HP-236 through HP-274. Complete the inventory of historic properties in the plan area, identifying the buildings deemed significant and identify plans for preservation (as distinct from “stories” and “recognition”). [Draft01]

Implementation Element
• Pages IM-278 through IM-280. With regard to planned transportation improvements, distinguish between commitments and general proposals. [Draft01]
• Pages IM-278 through IM-280. Explicitly require property owners to accept full ownership, responsibility, and liability for sidewalks adjacent to their properties, including public amenities provided in exchange for waivers, such as landscaping, fixtures (benches, sculptures, murals, lighting, etc.), and so on. [Draft01]
• Pages IM-282 through IM-301. Provide missing general regulations and supplemental development regulations. Also include details of environmental review/CEQA issues. [Draft01]
• Pages IM-282 through IM-301. Include in the Supplemental Development Regulations mechanisms to capture land value to pay for impacts to infrastructure, public facilities, services, safety, and affordable housing.

PROCESS REQUESTS APPROVED ON 12/5/23, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT’S RESPONSE:
• ASAP: Publish all comments on the current draft received by the Planning Department in writing, along with detailed notes of all comments received orally at meetings, workshops, Q&A sessions, etc., identifying sources and volume. Also
publish a summary of feedback, discussing and responding to all major points of criticism, requested changes, and/or additions. [NOT DONE.]

- Before publication of next draft (or any additional public presentations): Complete and publicly report all feasibility research on proposals in the current draft, including studies of impacts on traffic (including potential impacts on emergency vehicles and evacuation plans), parking (and potential “circling”), tree canopy and impacts on canyons, possible creation of environmental hotspots and pollution (due to large building AC/heating), environmental costs of demolition and building, infrastructure and maintenance needs, etc. Also provide an inventory of all of the potentially historic resources throughout the proposed Plan Hillcrest area, as well as other potential historic resources in Uptown related to LGBTQ+ history. [NOT DONE.]

- Before publication of next draft: Add consecutive pagination. Also, confirm by use of digital comparison tools AND multiple staff proofreaders that the next draft, presented as an annotated version of the 2016 Uptown Community Plan, clearly indicates ALL changes. Similarly double-check and confirm the contents of a Summary of Changes that should be published simultaneously. [PARTIALLY DONE.]

- Immediately upon online publication and distribution of next draft: Make available complete printed & bound copies of both documents described above: 2x: at Knox Library for review on site; 14x for own use by Uptown Planners board members; 25x for own use by media and interested neighborhood groups, individuals. Provide additional printed & bound copies timely if/as needed, based upon demand. [DONE.]

- After publication of next draft and before any presentations to Planning Commission or City Council: Provide minimum 12 weeks public comment time, with staff available at least weekly for working collaborative editing sessions with members of Plan Hillcrest Committee. [NOT DONE.]

- During public comment period on next draft: Hold public meetings designed for city staff to receive feedback from relevant agencies, departments and committees, including but not limited to Parks Advisory Committee, Historic Resources Board, Community Forest Advisory Board, Uptown Community Parking District. [NOT DONE.]

- During public comment period on next draft: Request formal feedback on implementation impacts of the proposed plan from sections of the Advisory Division of the Attorney General’s office: Environment & Land Use, Infrastructure, Neighborhood Services, Public Services & Public Safety. [NOT DONE.]

- ASAP: Provide details on funding and expenditures to-date and projected that are related to the Plan Hillcrest proposal in the Planning Department, including fees paid to outside consultants and estimated costs of dedicated staff time. [NOT DONE.]
November 15, 2023

Heidi Vonblum
Director, Planning Department
City of San Diego

RE: Position on Plan Hillcrest Draft Focused Plan Amendment to Uptown Community Plan

This letter notifies you of the position that Uptown Planners took at its November 7th board meeting on the Planning Department’s draft of its proposed amendment to the Uptown Community Plan, which the Planning Department has titled the “Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.”

Given the current timeline for approval now that we have finally been presented with a draft of the actual Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, we must have more time to consider what its changes mean to our entire Uptown Community Plan. If we do not receive more time to do this, and this plan is moved forward anyway, then we have no choice but to reject it and the changes that it proposes.

Uptown Planners board members expressed strong views about this project being too consequential—for Hillcrest, Uptown, and our entire city—not to have sufficient informed public input and substantive official community group consideration about the specifics of what is a substantially altered community plan. In order to potentially affect the outcome, such reviews would need to take place before presentation to the Planning Commission and other agencies.

To provide some factual context for the Uptown Planners position: Over three years ago the Planning Department announced its self-generated “Plan Hillcrest” initiative to radically expand the area and nature of policies included in Uptown’s approved 2016 Community Plan for the Hillcrest “core” and for recognition of Hillcrest’s LGBTQ history.

What ensued were a series of Planning Department slide show presentations (most led by consultants), featuring what were described as options, and which options typically were outlined only superficially and without substantiating research. The Planning Department also engaged in sporadic collection of feedback by various methods, none of which took the form of reliable research and all of which Planning Department staff characterized to Uptown Planners as nondeterminative.

While Planning Department staff sometimes made its presentations at meetings of the Uptown Planners ad hoc Plan Hillcrest Committee, Planning Department staff always worked independently, never collaborating with the Plan Hillcrest Committee to determine whether or how to develop the various options proposed. Often the Planning Department did not even give notice to Uptown Planners of presumably public outreach events, which Planning Department staff stated were with staff-selected “smaller groups.”

Then, on October 6th, the Planning Department publicly provided a comprehensive amendment of the entire Uptown Community Plan, setting its deadline for receiving comments as November 17th.
The draft that the public was given just six weeks to review included changes to every section of the approved 2016 Uptown Community Plan, expanding it in length from 224 to 280 pages (a 20% increase). Multiple detailed maps were replaced, each of which would be time-consuming to review. Strikingly, and without prior notice, despite the misleading term “focused” in the amendment title, a number of the changes proposed significantly alter aspects of the plan that affect all six of the neighborhoods in Uptown, not just Hillcrest, with potential effects even more far-reaching.

In addition, while the changes proposed to the plan supposedly all were flagged in a 24-page Summary of Changes, that document has proved to be incomplete, inaccurate, and inadequate as a guide. The draft also was provided to the public only in a PDF format that is not consecutively paginated and contains no internal links, making it difficult to navigate or to cross-reference to the Summary. Based upon multiple requests, the Planning Department recently promised a limited number of publicly available bound copies but has not yet provided them.

Importantly, the Planning Department was unavailable to brief the Plan Hillcrest Committee on the proposed plan until November 9th, which, as our CPG Liaison in the Planning Department is aware, is a date that fell after the regularly scheduled November meeting of Uptown Planners, giving the board no meaningful chance to respond.

When Uptown Planners requested an extension of the comment deadline, that request was refused. Being told that this is “just a first draft” is not reassuring because of the aggressive timeline the Planning Department has announced for moving the proposal forward early next year.

Please confirm your receipt of the Uptown Planners position statement provided in this letter. And please note this statement on the City of San Diego’s official website:

A community plan is developed through a partnership of the recognized Community Planning Group, the public, and City staff, working together to identify land use policies and recommendation[s] to guide future development of the community.

This letter is copied to the Chair of the Community Planners Committee, our District 3 Councilmember, and the Mayor to advise that no such partnership has taken place in developing the proposed massive and widely impactful amendment to the Uptown Community Plan.

Best regards,

Stu McGraw
Chair, Uptown Planners
Chair@uptownplannerssd.org
619-630-6910

cc:
Todd Gloria, Mayor
Stephen Whitburn, Councilmember District 3
Shannon Corr, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Community Planners Committee
December 6, 2023

Coby Tomlins
Program Manager, City Planning Department
Community Planning & Housing Division
City of San Diego

RE: Initial Comments on Plan Hillcrest Draft Focused Plan Amendment to Uptown Community Plan

Last night, at a regular meeting of our board, Uptown Planners approved the appended document: Initial Comments by Uptown Planners Community Planning Group on the Planning Department’s “Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Discussion Draft”

Because even these initial comments, based upon only a partial review, are extensive, the board directed me to emphasize this overarching point of our collective understanding:

Transportation analysis should be foundational in deciding upon a suitable plan for developing Hillcrest.

In addition, to ensure understanding and careful consideration of all of our comments, the board further directed me to make this request:

Schedule a meeting within two weeks to discuss all of our comments one-by-one.

I was asked to meet with you and Shannon Corr. I also was asked to bring with me one or two informed board members or members of the public. The board also requested that our District 3 Councilmember, Stephen Whitburn, be included in this meeting.

As you know, City staff independently developed its draft amendment to our Community Plan, despite City policy requiring partnership with the CPG. Dismayingly late as it is in the process, Uptown Planners still expects that the City will, at last, engage in such partnership. So, I hope to hear back from you very soon.

Best regards,

Stu McGraw
Chair, Uptown Planners
Chair@uptownplannerssd.org
619-630-6910

cc:
Shannon Corr, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Heidi Vonblum, Director, City Planning Department
Stephen Whitburn, Councilmember District 3
Hello Shannon

Correcting a portion of the supporting documents to the Uptown Planners Motion regarding Plan Hillcrest, to:

On page 8, the final bullet point ("ASAP: Provide details on funding and expenditures ....") is marked as "NOT DONE." But, in fact, it was done: The city put through a public records request; We received the 600 pages of results in February, 2024.

Thank you.

Jim

---

Jim Walsh
Chair, Uptown Planners
619-630-9610
Uptown
Community Plan
HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT
DRAFT
MARCH 2024
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street lights, and landscaped pedestrian buffers from vehicles, create impediments to walkability.

Canyons also provide mobility challenges with navigating the community. Through the years, several pedestrian bridges and trails have been built through these canyons, adding a unique pedestrian experience to the Uptown community. Despite the challenges, Uptown has an inviting pedestrian environment including a dense network of high intensity uses focused along major corridors, sidewalks and alleys, and a gridded street pattern. A majority of the retail use in commercial districts is oriented on the street front which increases pedestrian activity in the area. Parking in commercial districts and corridors is often limited or requires a fee, encouraging more walking trips, or more trips where customers park once and walk between several destinations.

The community plan focuses on improving pedestrian amenities to address challenges posed by natural topography and the existing vehicular-based environment. The Mobility Element provides recommendations to improve existing roadways conditions by diversifying its streets to include multi modal elements and improving the overall safety for non-motorized vehicle use. Maintenance Assessment District can help further pedestrian focused elements like pedestrian scale lighting, street furniture, landscaping and special paving improvements to support walking within the community. The recommended improvements include complete streets features. Areas of emphasis for pedestrian improvements in the Uptown community are provided in Figure 3-1.

General Plan Mobility Element, outlines related policies Pedestrian policies are numbered below as Policy MO-1.1 through MO-1.16. General Plan Mobility Element outlines related policies in Section A, Walkable/Rollable Communities, policies ME-A.1 through ME-A.9 and Table ME-1, the Pedestrian Improvement Toolbox should-to be consulted for guidance.

POLICIES

MO-1.1 Enhance existing pedestrian travel routes with amenities such as pedestrian streetlights, street furniture, trees, and wayfinding signs along commercial
Pedestrian Route Types
- District
- Corridor
- Connector
- Neighborhood
- Auxiliary Pedestrian Facility
- Parks / Open Space
- Community Plan Boundary

FIGURE 3-1: PEDESTRIAN ROUTES

The 1989 Balboa Park Master Plan indicated a Class 1 multi-use path along 6th Avenue and Balboa Drive.

The 1989 Balboa Park Master Plan indicated a pedestrian and bike bridge here.

I understand that Balboa Park directly in Uptown but is now considered as parkland for uptown and this context should be shown, perhaps with some notes on it being added to Uptown. Some of this will appear on the bike map as well.
corridors and streets leading directly to community destinations such as Balboa Park, and schools, libraries, neighborhood parks, pedestrian promenades, and farmer’s market.

**MO-1.2** Enhance pedestrian crossings at marked crosswalks through the implementation of advanced treatments that include but not limited to continental crosswalks, pedestrian activated crossing lights, flashing beacons, advanced signage, bulb-outs, right turn on red restrictions, pedestrian countdown signals, and/or pedestrian phasing at signalized intersections within the focus areas identified in the City’s pedestrian planning effort.

**MO-1.3** Consider installation of traffic calming measures such as raised intersections, raised crosswalks, corner bulb-outs, roundabouts/traffic circles along the following pedestrian corridors:

- University Avenue, at the intersections between of First Avenue–Dove Street, Third Avenue, Tenth Avenue, Richmond Street, and Normal Street.
- Normal Street, from University Avenue to Campus Avenue/Polk Avenue.
- Polk Avenue at Park Boulevard.
- Robinson Avenue, at the intersections with Fourth Avenue and Fifth Avenue.

**MO-1.4** Support pedestrian improvements that promote a safe connection along Washington Street between Hawk Street and India Street.

**MO-1.5** Consider mid-block crossings along commercial corridors and in other areas where warranted, to provide pedestrians additional opportunities to cross along streets with infrequent intersections, or where a direct route is needed to a popular destination.

**MO-1.6** Implement pedestrian enhancements within identified pedestrian focus areas developed as part of the pedestrian planning effort. These enhancements include but are not limited to bulb-outs/curb extensions, pedestrian promenades, enhanced crossing treatments, traffic calming, leading pedestrian intervals, continental crosswalk phases and exclusive pedestrian recall phases.

**MO-1.7** Increase pedestrian safety from the west side of Bankers Hill to Balboa Park by providing pedestrian improvements, as identified in the Bankers Hill/Park West “Walk the Walk” plan; of particular interest are the following locations:

- First Avenue at Nutmeg Street, Quince Street and Upas Street
- Fourth Avenue at Juniper Street, Spruce Street, and Upas Street.

*Landis and 29th Traffic Circle*
• Fifth Avenue at Grape Street and Juniper Street
• Sixth Avenue at Grape Street, Juniper Street as Nutmeg Street.

MO-1.8 Widen sidewalks where possible, especially along commercial streets and other high pedestrian traffic areas in the community, to allow two people to pass a third person comfortably.

MO-1.9 Prioritize the completion of missing sidewalk segments identified by the City’s sidewalk survey efforts.

MO-1.10 Continue to pursue school grant funding for safe routes to school and prioritize capital improvements that promote safe walking and biking routes to school and educational centers.

MO-1.11 Provide adequate travel width for mobility devices such as wheel chairs and motorized scooters by avoiding excessive signage and utility boxes in the public right-of-way.

MO-1.12 Support pedestrian improvements that promote safe connections along Washington Street from Lincoln Avenue to the bridge over State Route 163 in Hillcrest.

MO-1.13 Support implementation of improvements in Uptown identified in the City’s pedestrian planning efforts and Bicycle Master Plan.

MO-1.14 Implement traffic calming treatments on residential streets where excessive speeding occurs.

MO-1.15 Explore the feasibility of providing a pedestrian bridge over Washington Street west of Goldfinch Street.

MO-1.16 Create more definable pedestrian connections between the Medical Complex neighborhood and Hillcrest through the use of crosswalks, signalization, and pavement variations.

MO-1.17 Coordinate with San Diego Unified District on pedestrian improvements along Normal Street and potential right of way needed for intersection improvements at El Cajon Boulevard, Normal Street and Park Boulevard intersection which can include but is not limited to a roundabout traffic control, new crossings, linear park, etc.

MO-1.18 Coordinate with Caltrans to improve connections along University and Robinson Avenue bridge overpasses for pedestrians and bicyclists.

3.2 BICYCLING

The creation of an integrated bicycle network, will facilitate bicycling and help meet travel needs in the Uptown community. Bicyclists within Uptown utilize

Facilities that promote biking should accommodate all cyclists regardless of skill.

A cycle track along Fifth Avenue connects Downtown with Bankers Hill/Park West and Hillcrest.
This cycle track has been extended down Laurel to the west.

**Bike route (Class III) facilities shall provide bicycle sharrows, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

*Bike lane (Class II) facilities shall include a buffer, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

Bicycle facility recommended classifications have been developed at a planning level and may be refined upon further analysis at the project level.
of bicycle parking facilities.

b. Consider the use of multi colored bicycle racks (e.g. integrated with existing parking meters) to promote visibility and awareness.

MO-2.9 Coordinate with SANDAG on the planning and implementation of regional bicycle facilities.

MO-2.10 Support the installation of e-bike charging stations, bicycle corrals and other secure bicycle parking opportunities to enhance neighborhood identity within commercial corridors to support bicycle and foot traffic.

MO-2.11 Encourage training and safety awareness programs related to sharing the road with motorists and safe biking.

MO-2.12 Support repurposing of on-street parking to aid in the implementation of physically separated bicycle facilities

MO-2.13 Consider speed and volume management treatments along bicycle boulevards such as diverters, median chokers, pop outs and traffic circles.

MO-2.14 Coordinate with Caltrans to improve the University Avenue and Robinson Avenue SR 163 bridge overpasses for pedestrians and cyclists.

MO-2.15 Encourage residential developments to provide secure bike parking and e-bike charging

3.3 TRANSIT

A well-integrated transit network will improve community livability by increasing access to civic, commercial and employment destinations. Transit will need to be attractive, convenient and act as a viable choice of travel, reducing dependence on the automobile. Uptown is served by several bus routes that run in the east-west and north-south directions through the community and provide connections to areas throughout San Diego. Expanding transit services is an essential component to the Uptown Community Plan. Future transit stations will need to be integrated into walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods and centers.

Future transit service is identified in SANDAG’s San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RP). The RP identifies Commuter Rail, Rapid Transit, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Streetcar service within Uptown. The new improvements will improve the type of service, frequency of service and areas patrons can access. Figure 3-3 illustrates the transit network with the buildout of the RP.

The following are planned transit service enhancements for Uptown contingent upon future funding:

- **Commuter Rail will provide services from Downtown to El Cajon via San Diego State University and La Mesa with a 10-minute all-day frequency. The expected year for completion is 2050.**

- Route 10 will convert to a Rapid Bus Route with improvements to include expanding services to La Mesa and Ocean Beach. Route 10 currently travels along University Avenue and Washington Street in the Uptown corridor. The expected year for completion of this improvement is 2035.

- Route 120 will convert to a Rapid Bus Route along its current route along Fourth and Fifth Avenues and University Avenue in Uptown and continue to provide service between Kearny Mesa and Downtown, via Mission Valley, at 10-minute frequencies throughout the day. Improvements include transit priority measures and new transfer opportunities to the Green

A streetcar line between Downtown and the Hillcrest business core would provide another travel option in the community and serve as a tourism booster for the community.
FIGURE 3-5: PLANNED STREET CLASSIFICATIONS

Legend
- 1-Lane Collector (1C)
- 2-Lane Collector (no center lane)
- 2-Lane Collector w/Center Left Turn Lane (2C w/CLTL)
- 3-Lane Collector (no center lane)
- 4-Lane Collector (no center lane)
- 4-Lane Major Arterial (4M)
- 5-Lane Major Arterial (5M)
- 6-Lane Major Arterial (6M)
- Road With Dedicated Transit Facilities

Arrow Indicates Direction of Travel On One Way Streets

Community Plan Boundary

Connections Beyond Community Boundary

If University and Robinson are proposed as one way couplets based on the difficulty to make the two associated bridges more bike and pedestrian friendly, a partial lid on SR-163 between Robinson and University could resolve this issues and avoid the one-way couplet while preserving the two bridges considered to be historic by Caltrans. It can also address some much needed parkland and allow for adjacent redevelopment opportunities. (see attached Robinson Options)
bicycling, walking, and transit will become more viable modes of transportation.

General Plan Policies in Section C of the Mobility Element ME-C.1 through MC-C.7 and the Table ME-2 (Traffic Calming Toolbox) should also be consulted for guidance in addition to the following community-based policies for street, freeway, and intersection improvements:

**POLICIES**

**MO-4.1** Provide a complete streets network throughout Uptown, safely accommodating all modes of travel and users of the public right-of-way.

**MO-4.2** Repurpose right-of-way to provide high quality bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities while maintaining vehicular access.

**MO-4.3** Implement focused intersection improvements to improve safety and operations for all modes of travel.

**MO-4.4** Provide street trees, street lighting, and implement a wayfinding program.

**MO-4.5** Incorporate balanced multi-modal concepts into planning, designing, retrofitting and maintenance of streets.

**MO-4.6** Ensure efficient movement and delivery of goods to retail uses while minimizing impacts on residential and mixed-use neighborhoods.

**MO-4.7** Coordinate with Caltrans and SANDAG to identify and implement needed freeway and interchange improvements along State Route 163 and Interstate 5 to improve community accessibility to regional facilities and enhance active transportation modes along freeway interchanges.

**MO-4.8** Implement traffic operational improvements that support and facilitate ingress and egress movements of emergency vehicles accessing the Medical Hospital Complex neighborhood.

**MO-4.9** Implement road diets and traffic calming measures, such as traffic circles and roundabouts, where appropriate to improve safety and quality of service, and increase walking and bicycling in Uptown.

**MO-4.10** Prioritize safety improvements along transportation corridors to reduce transportation-related fatalities and injuries involving bicyclists and pedestrians as identified in bicycle and planning efforts such as Vision Zero and the Pedestrian Master Plan.

**MO-4.11** Implement focused intersection improvements to provide safety for all modes of transportation at major commercial intersections, at popular
Public parking improvements can serve the dual purpose of providing commercial parking as well as public space and art.

MO-4.12 Discourage vacating streets and alleys unless, in cases where the public right-of-way can still be utilized for significant public benefits such as linear, pocket, and joint use parks; access to open space systems; additional on-street public parking; and public access to individual parcels, or views of open space from public rights-of-way.

MO-4.13 Support the restriction of new curb-cuts and the consolidation or removal of existing curb-cuts where possible to increase on-street parking.

MO-4.14 Support the activation of alleys as additional connections in the street system and as serving business’ needs in the Hillcrest neighborhood to create additional connections in the street system and to serve business’ needs.

MO-4.15 Consider streetscape improvements along Evans Place and Harvey Milk Street that embodies woonerf principles to allow drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians to share the same right-of-way. Consider streetscape improvements along Evans Place and Harvey Milk Street to support a pedestrian friendly shared street environment within a shared right of way.

3.5 INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) are technologies that are applied to transportation systems such as vehicles, roadways, intersections, transit, and payment systems to improve their service. The goal of ITS application is to maximize efficiency of services, increase vehicle throughput, reduce congestion, and provide quality information to the commuting public. The application of ITS technologies can influence choices across all modes of travel by providing real-time and reliable information regarding transit arrivals and departures, parking structure space availability, electric and alternative fuel vehicle charging and fueling locations. Information may be relayed or provided in the form of flashing messaging boards, self-adjusting traffic signals during peak traffic hours, and variable tolls depending on roadway volumes. Such applications would be beneficial to the Hillcrest Business District and other neighborhood commercial areas where the location and availability of on-street and off-street parking would make shopping, dining, and conducting businesses more convenient for patrons.

General Plan Policies in Section D of the Mobility Element ME-D.1 through ME-D.6 as well as the following community-based policies should be considered when evaluating ITS improvements.

MO-5.1 Utilize Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements to improve safety—and efficiency, service—and reduce congestion, including but not limited to traffic signal coordination, pedestrian and bicycle detection, traffic and transit information, and transit signal priority measures. Deployment of ITS improvements should be targeted along Park Boulevard, Washington Street, University Avenue, Fifth Avenue, Robinson Avenue, and Sixth Avenue.

MO-5.2 Support implementation of ITS strategies such as smart parking technology, traffic
Electronic parking meters can provide adjustable time duration rates and statistical data on parking utilization.

Private developments can assist in addressing existing parking needs through shared parking opportunities during off-peak times.

MO-6.4 Encourage large employers such as hospitals and the San Diego Unified School District to provide transit passes at reduced rates to employees/students, and to allow for flexible work schedules, provide on-site showers and lockers, and charge for parking in order to shift vehicular trips to off-peak periods, reduce congestion and improve public health.

3.6 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) combines marketing and incentive programs to reduce dependence on automobiles and encourage use of a range of transportation options, including public transit, bicycling, walking, and ridesharing. These management strategies serve to reduce congestion and parking demand in Uptown.

*General Plan Policies in the Mobility Element, Section E. Complete Streets* ME-E.1 through ME-E.8, as well as the following community-based policies should be considered when evaluating the application of TDM strategies with new development.

**POLICIES**

MO-6.1 Encourage new commercial, residential and institutional developments, as well as any new stand-alone parking facilities to provide parking spaces for car-sharing, bicycles, electric bicycle charging stations, and shared micromobility devices.

MO-6.2 Encourage new multifamily residential development to incorporate alternative measures to reduce any need to provide parking spaces in excess of required minimums, which could include, but are not limited to, incorporating car-sharing spaces, bicycle parking, and providing discounted transit passes to residents.

MO-6.3 **Encourage Support** new multifamily residential rental developments to that

and transit information dynamic message signs, traffic signal coordination, and transit priority.

MO-5.3 Encourage accommodation of emerging technologies such as car charging stations and self-driving/automated vehicles in future infrastructure and development projects, especially in new office and multifamily structures.

3.7 PARKING MANAGEMENT

Unbundle parking spaces from the rental cost of dwelling units.

Consider parking shade structures that contain PV panels and charging stations in public rights away as appropriate. Consider green energy production on any Caltrans ROW airspace areas consistent with SB49 legislation.

**Private developments can assist in addressing existing parking needs through shared parking opportunities during off-peak times.**

Electronic parking meters can provide adjustable time duration rates and statistical data on parking utilization.
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FIGURE 4-8: HEIGHT & MASSING CONCEPT 1 - NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
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Editor's Note: The following LGBTQ+ Culture Element is a new addition to the Uptown Community Plan. Text shown in blue font reflects edits between the October 2023 Discussion Draft and the March 2024 Draft.
5.1 LGBTQ+ CULTURAL DISTRICT

WHAT IS A CULTURAL DISTRICT?

A cultural district is an area of the city formally recognized for its people, history, events, and culture. Cultural districts can be recognized locally by City Council resolution and at the state level with certification from the California Arts Council. Cultural Districts may be described as a vibrant tapestry woven from the threads of heritage, history, and shared experiences, all taking place in a concentrated space where culture and creativity flourish. They house a collection of venues, landmarks, and activities that collectively express a distinct cultural identity. Cultural districts showcase local traditions and values, but they can also adapt, offering a space where the values and expressions of multiple cultures converge into a rich mosaic.

WHY IS A CULTURAL DISTRICT IMPORTANT FOR HILLCREST?

Centered at the heart of Hillcrest, the LGBTQ+ Cultural District, shown in Figure 5-1, will stand as a testament to the dynamic power of the organizations, people, businesses, and events that have shaped both the Hillcrest neighborhood and the LGBTQ+ community in San Diego. It’s not just the bars, cafes, or Pride Plaza, but the entire neighborhood, its streets, street corners, sidewalks, and alleys that hold meaning. The LGBTQ+ community in San Diego is rooted in a history of resilience, activism, and solidarity. This district will tell stories of discrimination, hardship, and repression together with stories of resistance, unity, progress, and love. Through a thoughtful blend of cultural elements, public spaces, and community initiatives, the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will pay homage to the struggles that have shaped its community and embrace a dynamic present and future. It will serve as an ever-evolving hub for expression, acceptance, and education, and invite both locals and visitors to engage with and appreciate the invaluable contributions of the LGBTQ+ community within the broader context of Hillcrest’s diverse cultural landscape.

Key Objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District Include:

• Commemorate, recognize, and highlight the people, spaces, buildings, events, and physical elements that contribute to the history and culture of the LGBTQ+ community in Hillcrest.
• Elevate the voices of under-represented and under-valued populations and organizations.
• Foster a spirit of pride and solidarity in our community in the face of new opportunities and challenges.
• Offer welcoming safe spaces for members of the LGBTQ+ community to gather and express themselves freely.
• Recognize Hillcrest as a center for community organization and LGBTQ+ activism in the past and currently throughout history and currently as a place that continues to foster racial, ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity.
• Acknowledge the importance of entertainment and commercial business establishments and organizations in Hillcrest that welcome, serve, and represent the LGBTQ+ community and form a significant part of the LGBTQ+ culture and history.
• Present a collection of interpretive elements that communicate the intangible values associated with Hillcrest’s history and culture.
• Feature a walking corridor consisting of conceptually connected “parklets” or other interpretive elements at key locations that are themed to recognize the location’s significance in LGBTQ+ life in Hillcrest.
• Feature personal quotes and stories from individuals in the LGBTQ+ and/or Hillcrest community.
• Provide policy guidance for the future implementation of public spaces and programming.
FIGURE 5-1: LGBTQ+ CULTURAL DISTRICT
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Why the full focus plan area and not the original cultural district?
5.2 HISTORY + CULTURE

Originally, Hillcrest was home to young families and a strong Italian-American and Veterans community. By the 1960’s, the demographics of the neighborhood had changed as families fled to the suburbs and older residents passed away, resulting in large vacancies across the neighborhood. This provided an opportunity for gays and lesbians seeking a quiet, safe, and welcoming neighborhood with affordable housing and opportunities to establish businesses.

Today, Hillcrest is a vibrant “heart” of the LGBTQ+ community, with well-established LGBTQ+ businesses and organizations and a significant population of LGBTQ+ residents. A brief timeline of key historic events is provided below. For more extensive literature on the LGBTQ+ community in San Diego and Hillcrest history, see the “San Diego Citywide LGBTQ+ Historic Context Statement” (2016), the “Uptown Community Plan Update: Historic Context Statement (2015), and Lambda Archives (https://www.lambdaarchives.org).

In 1870, Mary Kearney receives a land deed from the city for what would later become Hillcrest. Railroad magnate George Hill purchases the land and initiates development around 1910. The neighborhood becomes part of San Diego’s extensive streetcar system.

In 1940, while the rest of the world is at war the famous “HILLCREST” lighted sign is erected at the University and Fifth Avenue Intersection.

The birth of the modern gay rights movement in 1969 resulted in a new era in Hillcrest history. During the 1970s, gays and lesbians begin to establish residences, businesses, and organizations in this location.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Hillcrest transforms from a postwar, near-wasteland of single family homes, to a safe haven for gay and lesbian San Diegans escaping hostility in other neighborhoods.

1973: The Imperial Court, a charity organization started by “drag queens,” holds its first coronation ball.

1968: The Show Biz Supper Club opens as the city’s first female impersonator show at the current site of Baja Betty’s.

1963: The city’s first openly gay bar, The Brass Rail, moves from downtown to Hillcrest.
The Hillcrest Youth Center opens its doors and becomes a critical resource for LGBTQ+ youth in 2000.

In January of 2020, a rainbow crosswalk is unveiled at the intersection of Normal Street and University Avenue.

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District is formed in 2024.

Established in 2000, The Center’s Hillcrest Youth Center (HYC) is San Diego County’s pioneering drop-in hub for LGBTQ+, nonbinary, and HIV-positive youth. Offering safe spaces and affirming programs for diverse age groups, the 2023 forever home features multiple activity rooms, a community closet, game room, library, and outdoor spaces for a holistic experience.

The city approves plans for a large, privately funded rainbow flag at the corner of University Avenue and Normal Street in 2012. The city also approves a change in the street name from Blaine Avenue to Harvey Milk Street.

In 1975, First official Pride Parade and Rally is held. It is the start of gigantic annual celebrations of gayness and demands for equality in San Diego. The parades have grown exponentially from 700 participants in 1980 to over 300,000 in 2023.

The Flame, the city’s most high-profile lesbian bar, closes its doors in 2004, followed shortly thereafter by Numbers Nightclub, closed in 2017.

During the HIV and AIDS epidemic of the 80’s and 90’s, Hillcrest becomes ground zero for support groups (such as Mama’s Kitchen) and health organizations serving those affected by the disease.

The LGBT Center moves from Normal Street to Centre Street and begins plans for renovations in 1999, as well as the Hillcrest Youth Center which opens its doors and becomes a critical resource for LGBTQ+ youth in 2000.

The city’s most high-profile lesbian bar, The Flame, closes its doors in 2004, followed shortly thereafter by Numbers Nightclub, closed in 2017.

The LGBT Center moves from Normal Street to Centre Street and begins plans for renovations in 1999, as well as the Hillcrest Youth Center which opens its doors and becomes a critical resource for LGBTQ+ youth in 2000.

The Hillcrest Youth Center opens its doors and becomes a critical resource for LGBTQ+ youth in San Diego in 1973.
5.4 INTERPRETATIVE ELEMENTS

A key component of the Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Cultural District includes the incorporation of interpretive elements in the neighborhood to signify and highlight the history and culture of Hillcrest through artwork, buildings, streetscape, and signage.

Interpretive elements are the threads of meaning that weave together the fabric of a cultural district. They encompass a range of artistic and interactive elements carefully designed to unravel stories, evoke emotions, and spark dialogues. These elements serve as windows into the rich tapestry of history, heritage, and creativity that shape a community's identity.

To express authentic meaning, proposed interpretive elements must be inspired from and implemented by the local community-based organizations, businesses, and individuals in the Hillcrest community. They can take the form of a noticeable sculpture or mural in a prominent neighborhood corner or gathering spot. They can be subdued and embedded in the streetscape, such as Doron Rosenthal’s “Fossils Exposed” pavement tiles along University Avenue. They can tell a story along a path, such as Lynn Susholtz’s Vermont Street Bridge. Whatever they may be, interpretive elements provide an opportunity to tell a story. For those interested in contributing to the cultural richness of Hillcrest, there is an open invitation for people or organizations to provide walking tours or propose new historic or interpretive elements.

The following pages offer a tile-work of opportunities for consideration. An incremental and sustained attention to communicating LGBTQ+ culture through art, buildings, streetscape, and signage in the neighborhood will elevate the legibility and “brand” of the cultural district so when a visitor arrives in Hillcrest they know where they are; they know they are in the LGBTQ+ heart of San Diego.

“The bars and businesses were our safe haven, our center, where you knew what was going on. They were not just a place to get a drink, they were our ‘Paul Revere Place’”  - Nicole Murray Ramirez

“The bars and businesses are safe spaces, common ground, where you can be yourself”  - Susan Jester

“I just love our spot in the neighborhood; we are a home for the marginalized of the marginalized, the non-gender, trans, BIPOC community”  - Moe Girton, Gossip Grill
Buildings play a pivotal role in a cultural district, not just as physical spaces, but as storytellers of the community's journey. Through interpretive elements such as plaques and installations, buildings become conduits for sharing stories of struggle, resilience, and celebration. They help contextualize the LGBTQ+ experience, creating a tangible and immersive way for visitors to connect with the district's cultural significance and history.

Potential Interpretive Elements:

- Color
- Lighting
- Murals
- Plaques
- Memorials
- Design Features
- Spaces for Events/Gatherings
- Painted Storefront Windows
RECREATION

78.1 PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES
78.2 PRESERVATION
78.3 ACCESSIBILITY
78.4 OPEN SPACE AND RESOURCE-BASED PARKS
A system of pedestrian paths and bikeways linking population-based parks with resource-based parks and open space lands within the Uptown Community.

As a growing community underserved by parks and recreation facilities, Uptown should benefit from the Parks Master Plan: Parks For All, a goal of the City to acquire 100 acres for population-based parks in the first ten years following the Parks Master Plan's adoption.

### 78.1 PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

#### PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITY STANDARDS

The General Plan Recreation Element describes three categories of parks within the City of San Diego: Open Space Lands, Resource-based Parks, and Population-based Parks. (See General Plan Section RE-4 RE-5 Open Space Lands and Resource-Based Parks for descriptions.) Population-based parks and recreation facilities are typically located within close proximity to residents and are intended to serve the daily recreational needs of the neighborhoods and community. The General Plan standard is to provide a minimum of 2.8 usable acres of public park land per 1,000 residents. A recreation center, typically 17,000 square feet in size, should be provided for every 25,000 residents, and an aquatic complex should be provided for every 50,000 residents. Table 3: Parks and Recreation Facility Typologies from the parks Master Plan provides the descriptions and minimum standards for these park and recreation facilities.

EXISTING AND FUTURE POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

At full community development, the projected population for Uptown is 109,800 113,500 58,870. Therefore, according to General Plan standards for population-based parks and recreation facilities, the community should be served by a range of different park and public spaces, in accordance with the Parks Master Plan 164.84 usable acres of park land.

### GENERAL PLAN GUIDELINE CALCULATIONS FOR PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES

**Parks:** Parks standard is 100 recreation value points per 1,000 residents, 113,500 people divided by 1,000 = 113,500 recreation value points. 164.84 acres of population-based parks

**Recreation Center:** (17,000 square feet) serves population of 25,000: 109,800 113,500 58,870 people divided by 25,000 people = 4.39 4.5 2.35 Recreation Centers = 74,630 40,032 square feet total

**Aquatic Complex:** serves population of 50,000: 109,800 113,500 58,870 people divided by 50,000 people = 2.2 2.27 4.18 Aquatic Complexes

---

The Parks Masterplan identifies a complete list and description of park typologies (Table 3, pages 23-34):

1. Major Park
2. Community Park
3. Neighborhood Park
4. Mini Park
5. Pocket Park or Plaza
6. Special Activity Park

---

Roosevelt Middle School Joint Use Facility provides play fields, a walking track and tennis courts.
at full community development. (See Parks Master Plan Appendix D)

Additionally, at full community development, the projected population warrants approximately four two recreation centers equivalent to 40,032 total square feet, and approximately one aquatic complex.

Opportunities for additional park land and recreation facilities within Uptown are anticipated to come primarily through redevelopment of private and public properties and through the application of Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs) which can be found in the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone in the Implementation Element. While the City’s primary goal is to obtain land for population-based parks, where vacant land is limited, unavailable or cost-prohibitive, the City’s General Plan allows for the application of multiple park typologies, as defined in the Parks Master Plan, to be determined by the community and City staff through city-wide park acquisition/development prioritization efforts and a set of guidelines.

Facilities that may be considered as population-based park and recreation facilities include:

1. Joint-use facilities;
2. Trails through open space;
3. Portions of resource-based parks;
4. Privately-owned, public open spaces (POPOS) publicly used parks;
5. Non-traditional parks, such as rooftop or indoor recreation facilities;
6. Facility or building expansion or upgrades;
7. Linear promenades within rights-of-way and linear parks on new development subject to public space SDRs.

Uptown is an urbanized community where non-traditional parks are appropriate for satisfying some of the community’s population-based park needs. The community and City staff identified and evaluated population-based park and recreation opportunities, as well as potential non-traditional park equivalency sites, for their recreational value, possible uses and functions, public accessibility, consistency with General Plan policies and guidelines, and other land use policy documents (e.g. Parks Master Plan, Balboa Park Master Plan, MSCP Sub Area Plan, and San Diego River Master Plan). It was determined that a variety of sites and facilities within and adjacent to Uptown do, or could, serve as population-based parks or park equivalencies.

Tables 7-8-1a, 7-8-1b, and 7-8-2 summarize the existing and proposed parks, recreation centers, and aquatics.

Sixth Avenue Children’s Playground is located in Balboa Park and features several play areas, picnic facilities, and passive lawn areas.

Nate’s Point Off-Leash Dog Area is a popular recreation facility located within Balboa Park.
### TABLE 8-1A: POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES INVENTORY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKS / RECREATION FACILITIES</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING REC VALUE</th>
<th>FUTURE ADD REC</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE</th>
<th>FUTURE ACREAGE (BR/ACS/E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Recreation Center - South</td>
<td>Uptown Rec Center #3: Proposed recreation facility located in the southern portion of the community.</td>
<td>Design and construct an approximately 17,000 sq. ft. recreation center including a gymnasium, community meeting and multi-purpose rooms, arts &amp; crafts rooms, and fitness rooms.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Recreation Center - West or East</td>
<td>Uptown Rec Center #4: Proposed recreation facility located t.b.d.</td>
<td>Acquire land or acquire public access on private development; design, and construct an approximately 17,000 sq. ft. recreation center including a gymnasium, community meeting and multi-purpose rooms, arts &amp; crafts rooms, senior’s room, and fitness rooms.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Aquatic Complex</td>
<td>Proposed aquatic complex #2 to be located at a site to be determined within Uptown.</td>
<td>Acquire land if the location is not within an existing park site. Design and construct an aquatic complex, sized to meet community needs, including a swimming pool, universal access and water amenities such as a children’s pool and a therapeutic pool, and a pool house including locker rooms, staff offices and equipment storage facilities.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills Park (includes Pioneer Memorial Park) Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Existing park consisting of passive recreation amenities, such as multi-purpose turf areas, parking lot, a children's play area, seating, picnicking, walkways, and landscaping.</td>
<td>Possible improvements suggested by neighbors include construction of a permanent stage (5,000 s.f. minimum size paved area) with seating, lighting and utilities (power, data, sound) for concerts &amp; other special events; potential playground expansion, install fitness equipment, additional tree planting, and the installation of additional interpretive historical displays to complement Pioneer Memorial Park. Install trailhead amenities including a kiosk, pet waste station, and seating at the origin of Robin Egg Trail on Washington Place.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynard Way Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Proposed park site on undeveloped property, consisting of multiple, privately-owned parcels, located at 3532 Reynard Way. The site consists of varied topography and a potentially historically significant building which would present some developmental challenges, but would yield many recreational opportunities. Adaptive reuse of the building for recreational purposes is a possibility.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct active and passive park amenities such as an approximately 4,500 square foot children’s play area, multi-purpose turf areas, a full-sized softball field with sports lighting, tennis courts with sports lighting, half basketball courts, a multi-use walking path, a fitness equipment circuit, a fenced off-leash dog area, space for community garden plots, interactive/educational elements, two all weather shade pavilions with picnic tables, a restroom building, public art/placemaking features, wayfinding signage system, and install complimentary native landscaping to restore transitional sloped areas. Opportunity to provide features for disabled users by improving the existing “Goldfinch footpath” to provide accessibility to higher elevation points in the future. Recommend establishing a street tree canopy along Reynard Way in addition to bus stop improvements.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mirs Parks / Pocket Parks / Plazas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandini Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned property located at the terminus of Bandini Street, north of Alameda Terrace, and adjacent to the Mission Hills Open Space.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities to include a children’s play area, seating, picnic areas, fitness circuit, walkways and landscaping. Consider designing space for community garden plots. Include interpretive signage about the history of the former Hebdon-Gill home which previously stood on this parcel.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned property located at the terminus of Clark Street, north of Alameda Terrace, and adjacent to the Mission Hills Open Space.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities to include passive recreation, such as seating, picnic facilities, an overlook and a trailhead to the adjacent Robyn’s Egg Trail.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street &amp; Robinson Avenue Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned property located on the northwest corner of First and Robinson Avenues.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities such as a children’s play area, seating, picnic areas, fitness circuit, walkways and landscaping. Consider designing space for community garden plots. Include interpretive signage about the history of the former Hebdon-Gill home which previously stood on this parcel.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Drive Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on city-owned open space land within the University Heights Open Space area directly adjacent to Golden Gate Drive.</td>
<td>Design and construct park amenities such as an overlook deck with seating, educational elements/signage, landscaping, and potentially a small fenced off-leash dog area.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned property located on the southwest side of Falcon Street, between Goldfinch and W. Thorn Streets.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities such as a children’s play area, seating, picnic areas and landscaping that optimize views towards Downtown. Potential opportunity to construct a raised viewing deck utilizing existing topography to enhance views Downtown.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 8-1A: POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES INVENTORY AND RECOMMENDATIONS - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKS / RECREATION FACILITIES</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING REC VALUE</th>
<th>FUTURE ADDED REC.</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE</th>
<th>FUTURE ACREAGE + REC. 4 FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front &amp; W. Juniper Streets Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on Fort District property, located on the southwest corner of Front and W. Juniper Streets, currently developed as a community garden.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities such as a children’s play area, seating, covered pavilion with tables/seating, walkways, and landscaping; continuation of the community garden use may also be considered.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58.625</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfinch Street &amp; Pennsylvania Ave. Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned property located on the west side of Goldfinch Street/Reynard Way, north of W. Pennsylvania Avenue.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities such as a children’s play area, seating, a covered pavilion with picnic tables, walkways, and landscaping. Recommend sidewalk improvements and bus stop facilities during park construction.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfinch &amp; W. Spruce Streets Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on undeveloped City-owned property located at the northeast of Goldfinch Street, south of the W. Spruce Street RDW (paper street) and W. Thorn Street.</td>
<td>Design and construct park amenities to include passive recreation, such as a children’s play area, walkways, seating, picnicking, and landscaping. Pursue inclusion of the W. Spruce Street RDW (paper street) in the planning and development of the pocket park.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on undeveloped City-owned land northwest of the intersection at Columbia Street and Laurel Street.</td>
<td>Due to proximity to the I-5 freeway, recommend constructing compatible recreational amenities such as community garden plots, a native plant garden with seating, or a skate/roll park.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Trolley Barn Park</td>
<td>Existing park consisting of passive recreation amenities such as multi-purpose turf areas, a children’s play area, gaming tables, seating, picnicking, walkways, and landscaping. Site amenities also includes a canyon overlook with views of Mission Valley.</td>
<td>Seek funding to implement improvements identified on the 2018 Unfunded Park Improvements list including the construction of a permanent stage at least 32’ x 16’ (size of a Show Mobile) for concerts &amp; other special events; repair erosion and plant fire resistant landscaping under the bridge on the north slope and landscaped areas; refresh metal benches, light poles, and railings on the bridge.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Existing City-owned park located southeast of Maple Canyon Open Space and north of Nutmeg Street. The GDP for development of the park was approved in 2019, and construction began in February 2023.</td>
<td>Complete development of the approved GDP. Future site amenities include an engineered grassy hill, Maple Canyon overlook deck with seating, adult exercise equipment/fitness circuit, children’s play area, paved walkway, lighting, interpretive signage, and an AIDS remembrance memorial.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60.375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and W. Thorn Streets Pocket Park</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on a vacant, privately-owned parcel, located on the northern corner of the intersection of State and W. Thorn Streets.</td>
<td>Acquire, design and construct park amenities such as a children’s play area, seating, and landscaping.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lewis Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>Existing park, located between Falcon and Goldfinch Streets, comprised of passive recreational amenities, a trail, public art, interpretive signage, and seating.</td>
<td>Construct Phase II improvements, including the trail connection with the existing Phase I, in accordance with the approved General Development Plan. Proposed pedestrian foot bridge would connect to existing public art at the intersection of W. Lewis St. and Goldfinch St. Recommend the installation of wayfinding signage on Falcon Street and Goldfinch Street to direct pedestrians to the park.</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo Waterman Pocket Park</td>
<td>Existing pocket on City-owned land adjacent to the Maple Canyon Open Space area. Park features include a walking path with stairs, landscaping, monument dedicated to Waldo D. Waterman, and a raised seawall with views into Maple Canyon.</td>
<td>Continue monitoring park condition and address maintenance issues as they arise.</td>
<td>21.875</td>
<td>21.875</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Joint-Use Facilities
- **Birney Elementary School**
  - Existing joint-use facility consisting of a multi-purpose turf field and paved walking track around the field.
  - Expand the joint-use agreement to include hard court areas including children’s play equipment, hard ball, basketball, and four square play areas. Monitor for need to add signage or additional security measures.
  - 56 | 115.5 | 1.82 | 3.67 |

- **Florence Elementary School**
  - Proposed joint-use facility.
  - Design and construct facilities pursuant to a future joint-use Agreement with the San Diego Unified School District. Potential amenities may include multi-purpose hard-surfaced courts and multi-use turf areas. Pursue a pedestrian connection between the joint-use area and the Mission Hills Hillscrest/Know Library.
  - 0 | 59.5 | 0 | 1.20 |

- **Grant K-8 School**
  - Proposed joint-use facility at school site.
  - Design and construct joint-use facilities, including multi-purpose playground, hard courts and gymnasium. Enter into a joint-use Agreement with the School District.
  - 0 | 28 | 0 | 1.00 |

---

**Unusual to be the same number added. Is this correct?**

**Added**

**Should this be 0?**

**Was called West Canyon Pocket**

**I would suggest that use agreements should generate full points, access it typically, 50%**
### TABLE 8-1A: POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES INVENTORY AND RECOMMENDATIONS - CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKS / RECREATION FACILITIES</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING REC VALUE</th>
<th>FUTURE ADDED REC</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE</th>
<th>FUTURE ACREAGE</th>
<th>BLDG SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal School Dog Park</td>
<td>Existing joint-use facility with the San Diego Unified</td>
<td>Expand the joint use agreement to include 8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District located south of Birney Elementary School</td>
<td>existing tennis courts and an approximately 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fronting Park Blvd., consisting of a small fenced</td>
<td>acre existing dirt field located between the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area</td>
<td>border of the San Diego Zoo and Zoo Drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trails/Open Space Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail/Open Space Trail</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankers Hill Open Space Trail</td>
<td>An existing ~1,400 foot unpaved trail within Bankers Hill Canyon Open Space that runs under the historic Spruce Street suspension bridge.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albatross Canyon Open Space Trail</td>
<td>Existing ~500 foot dirt trail within dedicated open space connecting Curlew St. to Dove St.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Canyon/Balboa Park</td>
<td>Existing trail network consisting of approximately 5,300 linear feet of dirt trail through open space within Balboa Park between Cabrillo Freeway/SR-163 and Richmond Street south of Cypress Avenue. The trail network connects to developed portions of Balboa Park including the Marston House west of SR-163 via Cabrillo Canyon Bridge.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Locally Serving Portions of Resource-Based Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Park</td>
<td>Proposed park located on the north side of the War Memorial Building at the intersection of Zoo Drive and Park Boulevard.</td>
<td>Design and construct park amenities such as seating/picnic areas, educational/interpretive displays to compliment the War Memorial Building, public art/placemaking elements, security lighting, restroom building, walking paths, and landscaping.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate's Point Off-Leash Dog Area</td>
<td>Existing off-leash dog area at Laurel Street and Balboa Drive.</td>
<td>Design and construct dog park upgrades such as additional drinking fountain, play/agility structures for dogs, additional seating, security lighting, and tree plantings.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Existing neighborhood park within Presidio Regional Park located on Cosoy Way and Presidio Drive. Park amenities include large multi-use turf areas, picnic tables, and a restroom building.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quince Street Mini-Park</td>
<td>Proposed mini park located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Balboa Drive and the Quince Street / SR-163 northbound exit ramp.</td>
<td>Design and construct facilities for active recreation such as a soccer field, pickleball courts, and/or baseball/softball fields with support amenities including a restroom building and locker room. Additional park amenities can include walking paths, landscaping, security lighting/ports lighting.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 8-2: SUMMARY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES - CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKS / RECREATION FACILITIES</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES LOCATION AND DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>EXISTING REC VALUE</th>
<th>FUTURE ADDED REC</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE</th>
<th>FUTURE ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Avenue Children’s Park</td>
<td>Existing park located between Sixth Avenue and</td>
<td>Design and construct amenities consistent with</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within Balboa Park)</td>
<td>Balboa Drive, and between Thorn Street and</td>
<td>the approved General Development Plan for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce Street. The park features a large children’s</td>
<td>Sixth Avenue Children’s Playground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>play area, multi-use pathways, a restroom building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benches, picnic tables, and multi-use turf areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partially shaded by trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Pocket Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pocket Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandini Street</td>
<td>Proposed pocket park on vacant, privately-owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>property located on the southwest side of Falcon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8-2: SUMMARY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Existing and Planned Parks and Recreation Facilities Community Summary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistics - 2021 Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population: 50,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Value Points Goal, 100 points per thousand: 5,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Recreation Value Points: 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2050 Population, Planned Facilities Built</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2050 Population: +13,590 109,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Value Points Goal, 100 points per thousand: +11,359 10,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Recreation Value Points: 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Additional Recreation Value Points: 2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current + Planned Recreation Value Points Total: 3,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Deficit Recreation Value Points: 7581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why were 18 parks dropped? If they were analyzed and found to be infeasible, then this should have been stated. Considering the major deficiencies in parks, the growth and the fact that likely only 25-35% of those new items on the list will ever be built, narrowing down now is not appropriate. There should be more identified opportunities that the future value may suggest, because many of these will fall off to the wayside.

There is not a summary included here for the Recreation Centers or Aquatic Centers. Since the points aren’t added to the total above, seems like there needs to be a summary points for this.

This is correct but not if some of the notes above are incorrect. I believe that the Waldo (-21.875 and Normal School dog park (-329) are incorrect. This would change to 2,069.86.
### TABLE 7-2: SUMMARY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED POPULATION-BASED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION-BASED PARKS</th>
<th>REC. VALUE POINTS</th>
<th>USABLE ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Population-Based Parks and Community-serving Recreation Park Equivalencies</td>
<td># points 44.66</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Population-Based Parks and Park Equivalencies</td>
<td># points 59.92</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing and Proposed Population-Based Parks and Equivalencies</td>
<td># points 104.58</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-Based Park Requirements at Full Community Development</td>
<td># points 164.84</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-Based Park Deficit at Full Community Development</td>
<td># points 06.02</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION CENTERS</th>
<th>SQUARE FEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Recreation Centers:</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Recreation Center: Grant K-8 School Gymnasium</td>
<td>10,454 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Recreation Center: Uptown Recreation Center - North</td>
<td>12,578 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Recreation Center: Uptown Recreation Center - South</td>
<td>17,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing and Proposed Recreation Centers</td>
<td>40,032 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center Requirement at Full Community Development</td>
<td>40,032 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQUATIC COMPLEX</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Aquatic Complexes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Aquatic Complexes: Uptown Aquatic Complex</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing and Proposed Aquatic Complexes</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Complexes Requirement at Full Community Development</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also includes recommendations contained in the Balboa Park Master Plan, including the Sixth Avenue Area, where appropriate, as well as recommendations generated by the community and City staff for facilities outside of Balboa Park.

The community plan identifies joint-use of the future Grant K-8 School gymnasium, and the need for two future recreation projects, at sites to be determined, that will provide all of the recreation center space required to serve the community plan at full projected development. The plan also identifies the need for an aquatic complex, at a future site to be determined. To address the park deficit of -7,581 - 7,951 recreation value points 97.14 acres staff will continue to work with community members to seek future opportunities for new parks at various sites within the community plan area. Facilities of various types and sizes will be acquired, designed, and constructed in an expedited manner to address current and future major park deficiencies.

In addition to the inclusion of these projects in the citywide park prioritization program Uptown Impact Fee Study (IFS), identification of potential donations, grants and other funding sources for project implementation will be an ongoing effort. Figure 78-1, Parks, Recreation Facilities and Open Space, depicts the approximate locations of existing and proposed parks, recreation facilities, park equivalencies and open space.
POLICIES

RE-1.1 Preserve, protect and enhance the integrity and quality of existing parks, open space, and recreation programs in Uptown.

RE-1.2 Pursue land acquisition for the creation of new public parks and recreation facilities as opportunities arise, with a special effort to locate new park land and facilities in the central and northwestern areas of the community, especially through urban infill and redevelopment proposals.

RE-1.3 Pursue non-traditional park opportunities equivalencies identified in Tables 78-1a/b, Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory and Recommendations, as opportunities arise.

RE-1.4 Encourage new private development proposals to include recreational facilities within their land holdings to serve all residents in areas of the community where there are land constraints. Provision of non-traditional park and recreation amenities should be considered on rooftops of buildings and parking structures, and/or on the ground level or within new buildings.

RE-1.5 As public agency land or buildings are redeveloped, active or passive recreation should be incorporated into buildings, support facilities (e.g., parking structures), or the surrounding exterior lands, where space allows.

RE-1.6 Increase recreational opportunities by acquiring and developing land through street/alley rights-of-way vacations (paper streets), where appropriate, to provide for park and recreation uses.

RE-1.7 Promote safety of Uptown parks by providing park designs that incorporate the City’s ‘Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design’ (CPTED) measures (see General Plan Policy UD-A.17).

RE-1.8 Construct the proposed Pershing Recreation Complex as recommended by the Balboa Park East Mesa Precise Plan to serve the Downtown, Golden Hill, North Park, and Uptown Communities.

RE-1.9 Acquire land, design and construct recreation centers in Uptown.

Streets with excessive right-of-way should be considered for potential recreational, urban greening, and multi-purpose opportunities.

Conceptual rendering showing a redesign of Normal Street as a potential park. (updated graphic)
FIGURE 8-1: PARKS, RECREATION FACILITIES AND OPEN SPACE
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Where is the Normal School dog park at?

Why are there only 2 parks cross off when there are actually 18 that were dropped?

Add a partial of full bridge deck for public plaza over SR-163. This can solve other mobility and cultural district improvements as well.

Already an existing park but can have amenities added to it.
based parks, and focusing passive use improvements at various open space areas. Aside from trails, only passive uses are allowed in the City’s Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), therefore, to protect the natural resources and still add recreation value, interpretive signs should be featured at open space parks to educate the public on the unique natural habitat, scenic value and the history of the place.

**POLICIES**

**RE-2.1** Preserve, protect and manage the natural, cultural, and historic resources that serve as recreation facilities in Uptown.

**RE-2.2** Expand/upgrade the recreation facilities on the western mesa of Balboa Park consistent with the Balboa Park Master Plan to meet existing and future demand. Use sustainable methods and materials (such as native and low-water using plants), and “green” technology that also respects any historical significance of the area.

**RE-2.3** Preserve, expand and enhance existing park and recreation facilities to increase their life span, or expand their uses and sustainability.

**RE-2.4** Provide sufficient human and economic resources to preserve and enhance the existing parks and open space areas serving Uptown.

**RE-2.5** Preserve and protect City-owned open space canyons within the community by providing interpretive signs to explain the biologic and scenic value of the open space systems.

**RE-2.6** Preserve, protect and restore canyons and hillsides as important visual features of community definition.

**RE-2.7** Provide trailhead pocket parks with ecologically-sensitive recreational uses as enhanced gateways to open space lands.

**RE-2.8** Protect and preserve native species and the unique habitats they depend upon within the open space systems consistent with the MSCP guidelines (see Conservation Element.)

**ACCESSIBILITY**

Accessibility within Uptown has three main components: 1) all facilities should be located within walking distance of neighborhoods and employment centers; 2) facilities should be accessible to the broadest population possible; and 3) facilities should be open for use by the general public with a balance between programmed and non-programmed activities.

All parks and recreation facilities within Uptown are planned to be linked by a network of existing and proposed transit routes, bikeways, and/or pedestrian paths. For discussions on accessibility to parks and open space, see Mobility Element policies related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian routes.

The West Mesa of Balboa Park lies adjacent to the Bankers Hill/Park West neighborhood of Uptown.

Old Trolley Barn Park is a neighborhood park that provides passive recreation and hosts community concerts and festivals.
All new and existing parks and recreation facilities within Uptown are required to meet the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines when they are constructed or retrofitted for improvements or upgrades. This could include adding accessible pedestrian ramps, providing paved pathways at acceptable gradients that lead from a public street sidewalk or parking area to a children’s play area or other park destination, providing disabled parking spaces, remodeling of restrooms and building interiors.

Accessibility also means the availability of active and passive recreation to all community residents. When special uses are designed into parks, such as dog off-leash areas or community gardens, these areas should also include amenities, such as pathways, benches, exercise stations, or picnic tables on the perimeter that could accommodate more than one type of user and enhance the recreational and leisure experience. Special uses, such as dog off-leash areas and community gardens, would be required to undergo a City approval process prior to facility design.

POLICIES

**RE-3.1** Enhance existing park and recreation facilities in Uptown by optimizing pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, automobile, and alternative modes of travel.

**RE-3.2** Design all new recreation facilities for an inter-connected park and open space system that is integrated into and accessible to Uptown Community residents.

**RE-3.3** Retrofit all existing park and recreational facilities where appropriate to meet the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to accommodate persons with all disabilities.

**RE-3.4** Retain and enhance pedestrian and bicycle paths within Balboa Park, especially within the West Mesa, to connect with the surrounding community.

**RE-3.5** Provide information kiosks and maps at the gateways to the community that identifies all parks that serve Uptown and how to get to each by walking, biking or public transit. See also Urban Design policies related to signs and gateways.

**RE-3.6** Develop and increase access to senior and youth services, activities and facilities wherever possible within the community’s public park and recreation system, such as for the Chess Club, Horseshoe Club, and Bridge Club within the West Mesa of Balboa Park.

**OPEN SPACE AND RESOURCE-BASED PARKS**

Open space lands are City-owned lands located throughout the City, consisting of canyons, mesas, and other natural landforms. This open space is intended to preserve and protect native plants and animals, while providing public access and enjoyment by the use of hiking, biking and equestrian trails. See Figure 78-1, Parks, Recreation Facilities and Open Space.

In Uptown, there are several open space canyons that provide opportunities for experiencing the natural environment through low intensity recreational uses, such as hiking and bird watching. Any proposed improvements to existing trail systems shall be in...
compliance with Natural Resource Management Plans, if any, or other governing documents.

Resource-based parks are located at sites of distinctive natural or man-made features and serve the citywide population and visitors alike. Balboa Park is an approximately 1,200-acre regional facility contiguous to the southeastern edge of Uptown, as well as to the Downtown, North Park, and Golden Hill Communities, which contains specialty gardens and horticultural interests, and houses numerous arts, educational, recreational, social and sports organizations, primarily on the Central Mesa. The adopted Balboa Park Master Plan provides policies for the future development and enhancements within the western area of the park, located between Sixth Avenue and State Route 163, and Upas Street and Interstate 5. The Balboa Park Master Plan land use policy states that free and open park land is a dwindling resource which must be protected and recovered from encroaching uses whenever possible. Recommended improvements within Balboa Park to serve Uptown are included in Table 7-1, Population-based Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory and Recommendations.

POLICIES

RE-4.1 Protect the natural terrain and drainage systems of Uptown’s open space lands and resource-based parks to preserve the natural habitat and cultural resources.

RE-4.2 Protect and enhance the natural resources of open space lands by re-vegetating with native drought tolerant plants and utilizing open wood fences, where needed, adjacent to very sensitive areas to provide additional protection while still allowing views into the area.

RE-4.3 Require all storm water and urban run-off drainage into resource-based parks or open space lands to be filtered or treated before entering the area.

RE-4.4 Provide recognizable entrances (Trailhead Pocket Parks, as discussed in the Parks Master Plan trailheads) to the Mission Hills Open Space and Maple Canyon Open Space systems. The trailheads should include a kiosk that includes a way finding map that shows how the canyon interfaces with Uptown, as well as interpretive signage to educate users on the sensitive natural and cultural habitats and unique biologic and scenic qualities of these areas.

RE-4.5 Pursue public access easements for approximately 2,300 linear feet (LF) of existing trails located on privately-owned open space within the Buchannan Canyon (2,000 LF) and Mission Hills (300 LF) Open Space Lands where appropriate to maintain connectivity between trail segments.

RE-4.6 Evaluate utilization of paper streets as future park and open space opportunities by vacating street right-of-way, and acquiring the land for design and construction of park amenities to support passive recreation, such as pathways, overlooks, seating, interpretive signs and landscaping.

Park and recreation facilities should provide accessible pathways from the public sidewalk or from parking areas.

West Lewis Pocket Park provides passive recreation amenities including seating, interpretive signage and drought-tolerant landscaping.
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION

110.1 PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC CONTEXT

110.2 IDENTIFICATION AND PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

110.3 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES RELATED TO HISTORICAL RESOURCES
of Master Architects and Builders; as well as special elements of the Uptown Community's early development history. The MPL has a period of significance of 1871-1918 and is significant under the themes of “The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909;” and “The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929.”

RESOURCES IDENTIFIED DURING PUBLIC OUTREACH

Substantial public outreach with the local community planning group, regional and local preservation groups, and members of the community occurred throughout the development of the Historic Context and completion of the survey. This information was considered and often incorporated into the results and recommendations of the survey. As a result, the Uptown Reconnaissance Survey identifies as potentially significant all individual resources specifically identified as such by the community. The exception is properties that have been identified as potentially significant under the theme “Neighborhood Revitalization and the LGBTQ+ Community: 1970-Present.” When the survey work was conducted in 2004-2006, only properties that were 45 years old or older upon completion of the survey in 2006 were evaluated; therefore, no properties constructed after 1961 were evaluated by the survey. Additionally, due to the reconnaissance nature of the survey, properties that were significantly altered from their original appearance were not evaluated further to explore significance related to LGBTQ+ history and redevelopment of Hillcrest. In developing the final theme, staff conducted limited research, oral interviews and a walking tour in an effort to identify the location of resources that may be eligible under the final theme. Based on the results of this outreach, the following some resources have been identified as potentially significant, requiring additional site-specific evaluation (Table 110.7). A non-comprehensive study list can be found in Appendix E. Please note that this list is not comprehensive, and other resources associated with this theme may be identified.

In addition, four (4) potential historic districts have been identified (Table 110.8 and Figure 110.4) by the community. These include Allen Terrace, Avalon Heights, Hillcrest and San Diego Normal School/San Diego City Schools Education Complex. A map of these locations can be found in Appendix E. The San Diego Normal School/San Diego City Schools Education Complex was the subject of a reconnaissance survey commissioned by the University Heights Historical Society and completed by a qualified historic consultant. Staff conducted a windshield survey to verify the presence of a potential historic district in the other three (3) areas and concurred that these areas may be eligible for designation as potential historic districts. However, the windshield survey undertaken in these areas was not as thorough as the reconnaissance survey completed by the consultant, and did not include identification of contributing and non-contributing resources. In regard to Hillcrest, it must be noted that the survey work completed in 2004-2006 did not initially identify a potential district in the Hillcrest area. However, the date and reconnaissance nature of the survey significantly
limited the evaluation of resources associated with the final theme of revitalization and LGBTQ+ history. Given the fact that many businesses cater to and run by members of the LGBTQ+ community are concentrated within the Hillcrest area, along with residential units occupied by individuals and early advocacy groups, it is appropriate to identify the central portion of Hillcrest as a potential historic district under HRB Criterion A. In addition, because the Hillcrest Potential Historic District area includes 55 properties constructed from 1960-1975, and because the 2004-2006 survey did not consider any properties constructed post-1960 as potential resources, it is appropriate to consider that the district may also be eligible under HRB Criterion C. In order to bring these four (4) districts forward for designation, additional, intensive-level research will be required to evaluate the district and define a precise boundary, period of significance, significance criteria and contributing and non-contributing resources.

The potential historical resources identified by the Historic Resource Reconnaissance Survey and the public outreach process are protected and preserved to some degree through existing General Plan policies and the historical resources regulations and guidelines of the Municipal Code. In addition, to ensure the protection of potential historic districts from erosion due to insensitive redevelopment, supplemental development regulations will be established to assist in the preservation of the overall integrity of potential historic districts until such time as they can be intensively surveyed, verified, and brought forward for Historic Designation consistent with City regulations and procedures. Additional policies that address the potential historical resources of Uptown follow.

**POLICIES**

**HP-2.1** Provide supplemental development regulations for potential historic districts until such time as they can be intensively surveyed, verified, and brought forward for Historic Designation consistent with City regulations and procedures.

**HP-2.2** Intensively survey and prepare nominations for the potential historic districts identified in the Uptown Historic Resources Survey, and bring those nominations before the Historical Resources Board for review and designation. Prioritization of district nominations may occur in consultation with community members and stakeholders based upon a variety of factors, including redevelopment pressures and availability of resources.

**HP-2.3** Provide support and guidance to community members and groups who wish to prepare and submit historic district nominations to the City, consistent with adopted Guidelines.

**HP-2.4** Work with members of the community to identify and evaluate additional properties that possess historic significance for social or cultural reasons (such as an association with an important person or event) for potential historic designation.

**HP-2.5** Prepare Historic Contexts and Multiple Property Listings addressing Bungalow and Apartment Courts, properties associated with Kate Olivia Sessions, and Victorian-Era properties for review and designation by the Historical Resources Board.

**HP-2.6** Evaluate the identified Park Boulevard Historic District along with the contiguous “Park Boulevard Multi-Family Residential Grouping” on the east side of Park Boulevard identified in the North Park Reconnaissance Survey to determine if the area as a whole contains a sufficient
number of contributing properties to qualify as a historic district.

HP-2.7 Prepare a Citywide Historic Context related to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ+) history assist in the identification and preservation of resources significant to the LGBTQ+ community. Partner with local knowledgeable organizations and groups, such as the LAMBDA Archives and Hillcrest History Guild, to assist in the preparation of the Context and the identification of significant resources.

HP-2.8 Encourage the maintenance of historic sidewalk colors and scoring patterns, as well as the preservation of sidewalk stamps, which contribute to the historic aesthetic of the community and the fabric of historic districts.

HP-2.9 Preserve and protect historic lighting fixtures within designated and potential historic districts. Encourage the use of “acorn” style pedestrian lighting fixtures within designated and potential historic districts when new lighting fixtures are introduced or non-historic lighting fixtures are replaced.

HP-2.10 Conduct project specific Native American consultation early in the development review process to ensure adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites or sites with cultural and religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations and guidelines.

HP-2.11 Consider eligible for listing on the City’s Historical Resources Register any significant archaeological or Native American cultural sites that may be identified as part of future development within Uptown, and refer site to the Historical Resources Board for designation, as appropriate.

110.3 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES RELATED TO HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Revitalization and adaptive reuse of historic buildings and districts conserves resources, uses existing infrastructure, generates local jobs and purchasing, supports small business development and heritage tourism and enhances quality of life and community character. The successful implementation of a historic preservation program requires widespread community support. In order to better inform and educate the public on the merits of historic preservation, information on the resources themselves, as well as the purpose and objectives of the preservation program, must be developed and widely distributed.

There are a number of incentives available to owners of historic resources to assist with the revitalization and adaptive reuse of historic buildings and districts. The California State Historic Building Code provides flexibility in meeting building code requirements for historically designated buildings. Conditional Use Permits are available to allow adaptive reuse of historic structures consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the character of the community. The Mills Act, which is a highly successful incentive, provides property tax relief to owners to help rehabilitate and maintain designated historical resources. Additional incentives recommended in the General Plan, including an architectural assistance program, are being developed and may become available in the future.

In addition to direct incentives to owners of designated historical resources, all members of the community enjoy the benefits of historic preservation through reinvestment of individual property tax savings into historical properties and an increased historic tourism economy. There is great opportunity to build on the existing local patronage and tourism base drawn to the community’s neighborhoods and shopping districts by highlighting and celebrating the rich history of Uptown.

In addition to the General Plan Historic Preservation Element Policies, the following recommendations are
specific to Uptown for implementation of educational opportunities and incentives for preservation of the community’s historical resources.

POLICIES

HP-3.1 Provide opportunities for education and interpretation of Uptown’s diverse history through the distribution of printed brochures, mobile technology (such as phone apps) and walking tours, and the installation of interpretative signs, markers, displays, and exhibits at public buildings and parks.

HP-3.2 Partner with local community and historic organizations, including Mission Hills Heritage, Hillcrest History Guild and the University Heights Historical Society, to better inform and educate the public on the merits of historic preservation by providing information on the resources themselves, as well as the purpose and objectives of the preservation program.

HP-3.3 Outreach to the Mission Hills and Hillcrest Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), local businesses and other organizations operating within the potential historic districts and the various individually significant designated and potential resources to provide information on the benefits and responsibilities of historic resource stewardship.

HP-3.4 Work with businesses and organizations within Uptown to create and promote new marketing and heritage tourism programs and opportunities.

HP-3.5 Promote the maintenance, restoration, rehabilitation and continued private ownership and utilization of historical resources through existing incentive programs and develop new approaches, such as architectural assistance and relief from setback requirements through a development permit process, as needed.

Consider mitigations associated with partial historic demolition along with partial adaptive re-use or protection that is possible through a ministerial review process instead of a lengthy and costly discretionary review process. Developers avoid discretionary processes and if a project becomes designated, developers will not pursue. This could also be done if a property owner does not want to accept a historic designation but agrees to supplemental development agreements, partial preservation, educational and interpretive improvements and other public and historic benefits associated with the ministerial project.

HP-3.6 Commemorate and interpret the trolley line and its significance to the historical development of Uptown through markers, signage and educational materials.
IMPLEMENTATION

12.1 CONVERSION FROM PLANNED DISTRICT TO CITYWIDE ZONING

12.2 FINANCING MECHANISMS

12.3 PRIORITY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND FUNDING

12.4 COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION OVERLAY ZONE
INTRODUCTION

The community plan establishes policies to guide the growth of Uptown and provide for its quality of life. The adoption of a community plan is the first step in a two-step process. The second and equally important step is the implementation of the policies of the plan. The community plan will be implemented through different mechanisms which are outlined in this chapter. Implementing the public projects and improvements associated with the community plan will require the participation of City departments, regional agencies such as SANDAG and MTS, and the community.

The following key actions have been identified for the City and the community to pursue in order to implement the plan's policies and recommendations. These actions include, but are not limited to:

- Approve and regularly update an Impact Fee Study (IFS) identifying the capital improvements and other projects necessary to accommodate present and future community needs as identified throughout this plan.

- Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to ensure Development Impact Fees are expended on relevant and meaningful projects and enabling the quick delivery of public spaces and infrastructure.

Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to identify relevant and meaningful projects and enable the delivery of Public Spaces and infrastructure.

- Fund and construct facilities and other public improvements in accordance with the IFS, Five Year CIP and community input.

- Seek longer-term implementation strategies that could be considered towards meeting the community plan's identified improvement projects.

124.1 TRANSITION FROM PLANNED DISTRICT TO CITYWIDE ZONING

In 2000, the City's development regulations went through a major revision and the regulations of the Planned District Ordinances (PDOs) were used to help guide the creation of the citywide development standards for residential and commercial uses contained in the Land Development Code (LDC). Part of the intent of the LDC update was to phase out the PDOs and use citywide zoning to implement community plans, which would happen as part of the community planning process.

### TABLE 124-1: RECOMMENDED ZONE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID-CITY COMMUNITIES PLANNED DISTRICT</th>
<th>CITYWIDE ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR-3000</td>
<td>RM-1-1, RS-1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1500</td>
<td>RM-2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1000</td>
<td>RM-3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-800B</td>
<td>RM-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-400</td>
<td>RM-4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-5</td>
<td>CN-1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-3, CV-3</td>
<td>CN-1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-6, CV-4, NP-3</td>
<td>CC-3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-4, NP-2</td>
<td>CC-3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-2, CN-2A, CL-2, CL-5, CV-2, NP-1</td>
<td>CC-3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-1A, CV-1</td>
<td>CC-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LEWIS STREET PLANNED DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSPD</td>
<td>CN-1-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL ZONES CITYWIDE ZONE**

| RS-1-1, RS-1-2, RS-1-4, RS-1-5         | OR-1-1                  |

The adoption of a community plan is the first step in a two-step process. The second and equally important step is the implementation of the policies of the plan.

Implementing the public projects and improvements associated with the community plan will require the participation of City departments, regional agencies such as SANDAG and MTS, and the community.

The following key actions have been identified for the City and the community to pursue in order to implement the plan's policies and recommendations. These actions include, but are not limited to:

- Approve and regularly update an Impact Fee Study (IFS) identifying the capital improvements and other projects necessary to accommodate present and future community needs as identified throughout this plan.

- Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to ensure Development Impact Fees are expended on relevant and meaningful projects and enabling the quick delivery of public spaces and infrastructure.

Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to identify relevant and meaningful projects and enable the delivery of Public Spaces and infrastructure.

- Fund and construct facilities and other public improvements in accordance with the IFS, Five Year CIP and community input.

- Seek longer-term implementation strategies that could be considered towards meeting the community plan's identified improvement projects.

### TABLE 124-1: RECOMMENDED ZONE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID-CITY COMMUNITIES PLANNED DISTRICT</th>
<th>CITYWIDE ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR-3000</td>
<td>RM-1-1, RS-1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1500</td>
<td>RM-2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1000</td>
<td>RM-3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-800B</td>
<td>RM-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-400</td>
<td>RM-4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-5</td>
<td>CN-1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-3, CV-3</td>
<td>CN-1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-6, CV-4, NP-3</td>
<td>CC-3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-4, NP-2</td>
<td>CC-3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-2, CN-2A, CL-2, CL-5, CV-2, NP-1</td>
<td>CC-3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-1A, CV-1</td>
<td>CC-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LEWIS STREET PLANNED DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSPD</td>
<td>CN-1-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL ZONES CITYWIDE ZONE**

| RS-1-1, RS-1-2, RS-1-4, RS-1-5         | OR-1-1                  |

The adoption of a community plan is the first step in a two-step process. The second and equally important step is the implementation of the policies of the plan.

Implementing the public projects and improvements associated with the community plan will require the participation of City departments, regional agencies such as SANDAG and MTS, and the community.

The following key actions have been identified for the City and the community to pursue in order to implement the plan's policies and recommendations. These actions include, but are not limited to:

- Approve and regularly update an Impact Fee Study (IFS) identifying the capital improvements and other projects necessary to accommodate present and future community needs as identified throughout this plan.

- Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to ensure Development Impact Fees are expended on relevant and meaningful projects and enabling the quick delivery of public spaces and infrastructure.

Planning staff will engage with the community to guide the Five Year Capital Infrastructure Planning Outlook to identify relevant and meaningful projects and enable the delivery of Public Spaces and infrastructure.

- Fund and construct facilities and other public improvements in accordance with the IFS, Five Year CIP and community input.

- Seek longer-term implementation strategies that could be considered towards meeting the community plan's identified improvement projects.

### TABLE 124-1: RECOMMENDED ZONE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID-CITY COMMUNITIES PLANNED DISTRICT</th>
<th>CITYWIDE ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR-3000</td>
<td>RM-1-1, RS-1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1500</td>
<td>RM-2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-1000</td>
<td>RM-3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-800B</td>
<td>RM-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-400</td>
<td>RM-4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-5</td>
<td>CN-1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-3, CV-3</td>
<td>CN-1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-6, CV-4, NP-3</td>
<td>CC-3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-4, NP-2</td>
<td>CC-3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-2, CN-2A, CL-2, CL-5, CV-2, NP-1</td>
<td>CC-3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-1, CN-1A, CV-1</td>
<td>CC-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LEWIS STREET PLANNED DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSPD</td>
<td>CN-1-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL ZONES CITYWIDE ZONE**

| RS-1-1, RS-1-2, RS-1-4, RS-1-5         | OR-1-1                  |
IMPLEMENTATION
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plan update process. As part of the Uptown Community Plan Update process, the Mid-City Planned District Ordinance (MCCPDO) and the West Lewis Street Planned District Ordinance (WLSPDO) regulations were rescinded with implementation of the community plan land uses carried out through by the LDC.

The implementation program for the community plan replaces the MCCPDO and WLSPDO with citywide zones and development regulations. The zoning implementation program was approved concurrently with the community plan update. The transition from Planned District to citywide zoning is summarized in the Table 121-1 and demonstrates compatibility largely based on dwelling units per acre allowed and permitted uses. The implementation program for the community plan also included residential zones identified in Table 121-1 that were transitioned to an open space-residential zone to preserve privately-owned property that is designated in the community plan as open space allowing limited development. In instances where land uses were changed, appropriate zones were utilized. Certain commercial PDO zones listed in the table show multiple compatibility with Citywide zones as a result of varying densities that were allowed based on lot size.

HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment was adopted and incorporated into the Uptown Community Plan. The focused plan amendment built upon the 2016 Uptown Community Plan to address housing, mobility, and public space opportunities to strengthen the business district and bring neighborhood benefits where needed most. New land use designations were adopted for the parcels within the approximately 350-acre boundary. Two new community plan land uses were added to the Uptown Community Plan Land Use map, Community Commercial (0-218 du/ac) and Community Commercial (0-290 du/ac). To implement the new land uses, two new zones, CC-3-11 and CC-3-12 were also created. Refer to the Land Use Element section 2.1 Land Use Context for more information on the land-use designations of the Uptown Community Planning area.

COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION OVERLAY ZONE (CPIOZ)

The Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) is applied within the boundaries of the Uptown community per Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 14 of the Municipal Code. The purpose of the overlay zone is to supplement the Municipal Code by providing development regulations that are tailored to specific locations within the Uptown community to identify areas within the community where ministerial approval is granted for development projects that comply with the CPIOZ Supplemental Development Regulations as outlined in Section 12.4. The Uptown Community Plan contains two four distinct CPIOZ Type A areas as described in Section 12.4 and with buildings or structures that do not exceed a specific building height. The CPIOZ applicable areas are identified on in Figure 4-1212.1, CPIOZ Type A—Building Heights, CPIOZ Type A—University Heights, Mission Hills, Bankers Hill/Park West, Hillcrest Design District, Hillcrest Historic District, and Commercial Activity Area, and Government Office Use Area. Please refer to in section 4.5—Development Form CPIOZ of the Urban Design Element.

121.2 FINANCING MECHANISMS

This section discusses various financing mechanisms that could be used to encourage public and private development and investment in the community. Implementing improvement projects will require varying levels of funding. A variety of funding mechanisms are available depending on the nature of the project:

- Updated impact fees for new development. Citywide Development Impact Fees.
- Requiring certain public improvements as part of new development.
- Establishing community benefit districts, such as property-based improvement and maintenance districts for streetscape, lighting, sidewalk improvements, etc.

Table 121-2, City of San Diego Financing Mechanisms
Planners will be asked to periodically review their list of priorities. This approach is intended to provide staff a mechanism to establish annual programmatic and budgeting priorities and monitor progress in achieving the Plan’s vision. In conjunction with the City’s annual budget process, the identified projects and their priority may be adjusted given funding availability, feasibility of implementation, timing of private development, or as new funding opportunities are available over time.

The complete communities program and this Focus Plan has and will create significant impacts on transportation, parking, public services and park resources. The City will receive substantial tax base increases from development as well as permit fees and potential sales tax. Diverting or weakening the process for the collection and use of developer impact fees for local use is not acceptable. There needs to be a much greater assurance of processes and % of DIF collected to be used in Uptown for Uptown based growth and projects.

### TABLE 124-3: LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL FINANCING MECHANISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING MECHANISM</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK (I-BANK)</th>
<th>TRANSNET</th>
<th>PROPOSITION 1B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Low cost financing to public agencies for a wide variety of infrastructure projects</td>
<td>• Half-cent sales tax for local transportation projects that has been instrumental in expanding the transportation system, reducing traffic congestion, and bringing critical transit projects to life. Over the next 40 years, TransNet will generate $14 billion for transportation improvement projects and programs.</td>
<td>• Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Eligible Uses** | • City streets  
• Educational facilities  
• Environmental mitigation measures  
• Parks and recreational facilities  
• Public transit | • The local half-cent sales tax pays for upgrades to streets, highways, and transit systems, as well as environmental protection.  
• It is expected to raise $14 billion for important upgrades – such as adding high occupancy vehicle lanes and transit facilities – to Interstates 5 and 15, and 805, as well as State Route 94.  
• The TransNet extension also funds local roads, bike and pedestrian paths, smart growth projects, and habitat preservation, as well as new Rapid bus lines and rail service expansion. | • Congestion relief  
• Improve air quality  
• Enhance safety and security of transportation systems |
| **Funding Parameters** | The infrastructure State Revolving Fund Program offered by the I-Bank offers loans ranging between $250,000 to $10,000,000 with eligible repayment sources including General Fund revenues, tax increment revenues, and property assessments. | • Each local agency shall biennially develop a five-year list of projects to be funded with revenues made available for local street and road improvements under Section 4(D).  
• All projects to be funded with revenues made available under must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Project priorities or phasing shall also be consistent with the RTP. | • Varies, competitive application process  
• The program currently contains $1.5 million in funds available |
### TABLE 12.4: DEVELOPER/PROPERTY OWNER/USER FINANCING MECHANISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING MECHANISM</th>
<th>LANDSCAPING &amp; LIGHTING DISTRICTS/ PARKING DISTRICTS</th>
<th>BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS (BIDS)</th>
<th>DEVELOPER IMPACT FEES</th>
<th>EXACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Description       | • Assessment on properties located within a specific district that benefit from landscaping, lighting and/or parking  
|                   | • Alternatively, collection of parking in-lieu fees on new development in lieu of on-site parking | Annual fees paid by business owners and/or property owners to fund activities and programs intended to enhance the business environment in a defined area | Fees paid by developers to pay subsidize all or a portion of the costs of any public facility that are impacted by that benefits their development | • Payments made by developers or property owners in addition to, or in lieu of, development impact fees  
|                   | Where are these being generated since many projects have no parking requirement. | | | • Funds contributed are used to install selected public improvements  
|                   | | | | • Alternatively, developers are required to construct and deliver specific improvements |
| Eligible Uses     | • Landscaping districts allow for the funding of lights, recreational equipment, landscaping, and/or parking  
|                   | • Parking districts allow for the acquisition, improvement, and operation of shared parking facilities | • Marketing and promotion  
|                   | | • Security  
|                   | | • Streetscape improvements  
|                   | | • Operating and maintenance of public improvements  
|                   | | • Special events | Capital facilities or ongoing services, such as:  
|                   | Where are these being generated since many projects have no parking requirement. | | | • School impact fee,  
|                   | | • Mitigation fee (police, fire, park),  
|                   | | • Water meter installation,  
|                   | | • Sanitation capacity charge,  
|                   | | • Water system, and facility/backup facility charge | • Dedication of right-of-way streets and utilities  
|                   | | | | • Provision of open space  
|                   | | | | • Parks or landscape improvements  
|                   | | | | • Schools and community facilities |
| Funding Parameters| Funds are typically collected concurrently with property tax bill  
|                   | Parking in-lieu fees can be based on cost of off-site parking facilities | • Once established, annual BID fees are mandatory for businesses/properties located within the BID boundary  
|                   | | • Business-based BID fees are collected with business license fees; property-based BID assessments are collected on property tax bills | Fees are paid in the form of a specified amount as a condition to the issuance of building permits, request of a final building inspection or certificate of occupancy, an occupancy permit, or subdivision map approval | Typically paid or committed as part of the development approval process |

TOT collected fees and future park bonding and funds should also be listed here on this table to expand more options.
floors of a building above a specified height.

- **Street wall** means the exterior walls of the building fronting along a property line adjacent to any public street or the *Parkway*.

- **Throughway Zone** means the section of the public right-of-way between the *Furnishing Zone* and the *Frontage Zone* or the building fronting the street. It is the primary, accessible pathway that runs parallel to the street. The *Throughway Zone* ensures that pedestrians have a safe and adequate place to walk free of obstructions.

- **Tower** means the structural envelope located from the top of the *Building Base* to the top of the building.

### TABLE 12-5: CPIOZ TYPE A - BUILDING HEIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers Hill/Park West</td>
<td>65 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Historic District</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. BUILDING HEIGHTS

CPIOZ Type A - Building Heights, identifies areas as shown in Figure 12-21 where ministerial approval is granted for proposed *Development* projects with buildings or structures that do not exceed the height limitations set forth in Table 12-5.

**SDR-A.1: Building Height.** Proposed *Buildings* development projects that exceed the height limitations in the identified areas set forth in Table 12-5 may be approved to the maximum allowed height of the applicable base zone, or the maximum allowed floor area of the base zone for zones without a maximum height limit with a Site Development Permit per Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 4 of the Municipal Code if they comply with the applicable regulations of the Municipal Code and are consistent with the applicable policies in the General Plan and Uptown Community Plan.

### B. HILLCREST URBAN DESIGN DISTRICT

CPIOZ Type A - Hillcrest Urban Design District identifies areas within the community where ministerial approval is granted for proposed *Development* projects that comply with the following Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs).

These SDRs identify when a project *Development* in the Hillcrest District is required to provide a *Public Space*, a *Promenade*, a *Parkway*, or an LGBTQ+ Interpretive Trail improvement, as well as the requirements associated with each *improvement*. The purpose of these SDRs is to support a healthy and enjoyable community by providing new spaces for the public community members and neighbors to gather, relax, and recreate, and to support space within Parkways for walking, rolling, and biking by providing safe and enjoyable streets.

The following SDRs supplement the regulations in San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Chapter 13, the Landscape Regulations in SDMC Article 2, Division 4, the Climate Action Plan Regulations in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, and the City’s Street Design Manual. Landscaping right-of-way improvements required as part of these SDRs may also be used to satisfy related SDMC requirements.

### Public Space and Promenades

**SDR-B.1: Public Spaces.** The following SDRs apply to *Public Spaces*:

#### 1. Applicability

- **a.** All new *Development* on a premises equal to or greater than 25,000 square feet and with a total gross floor area equal to or greater than 75,000 square feet shall provide a *Public Space* that complies with SDR-B.1.b and SDR B.3, except for the following:

  - **i.** A *Development* that qualifies for an exemption to the Citywide Park Development Impact Fees by constructing on-site park improvements in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0640 and City Council Policy 600-
SDR-B.4: LGBTQ+ Interpretive Trail Paving. A development subject to SDR-B.2, SDR-B.3, and SDR-B.4, shall provide the following LGBTQ+ interpretive trail feature as part of the paving within the public space or promenade as follows:

1. Provide a 12-inch wide band of multi-colored paving in a meandering pattern parallel to the Parkway which conforms to the design guidelines in Appendix A-F.

2. Paving for the band shall consist of a minimum of 3 of the following colors: pink, red, orange, yellow, green, turquoise, indigo, violet, blue, black, brown, and white. Colors may consist of different shades.

3. Paving for the band may consist of color glass seeded aggregate, color precast concrete unit pavers, color tile pavers or surface applied pavement coating. Paint is not an acceptable permitted surface material.

4. Where a new development abuts an existing section of the LGBTQ+ Interpretive trail, the trail shall be designed and installed in a manner that creates a continuous “ribbon” of paving in alignment with the adjacent development where feasible.
ii. Recessed entrances up to a maximum of 25 feet in width.

iii. Additions and new construction shall comply with the building height and Tower massing regulations in SDR-B.10 C.3 and SDR-B.11 C.4.

**SDR-B.C.103: Building Height.** Building height shall not exceed a maximum of 100 feet. A maximum building envelope height shall be further defined as follows and as illustrated in Figure 12-4. Above the Street Walls, the maximum building envelope shall be defined by:

1. A minimum Stepback of 20-feet above the 30-foot Street Wall along Fourth Avenue, Fifth Avenue and Sixth Avenue; and

2. A minimum Stepback of 10-feet above the 30-foot Street Wall along Robinson Avenue and University Avenue.

**SDR-B.11: Tower Massing.** The coverage of a Tower shall not exceed 75 percent of the Building Base, as shown in Figure 12-4.

**SDR-C.4 Building Stepback.**

1. Along Fourth Avenue and Fifth Avenue, new development shall step back a minimum of 20 feet from the building façade of a contributing resource or the street wall of a non-contributing resource.

2. Along Robinson Avenue and University Avenue, new development shall step back a minimum of 10 feet from the building façade of a contributing resource or the street wall of a non-contributing resource.

3. A projecting balcony may encroach up to 4 feet into the required building stepback and have a maximum width of 8 feet.

---

**D. COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY AREA HUB**

The following SDRs supplement the sidewalk cafes, streetaries, and active sidewalks regulations in the SDMC, Chapter 14, Article 1, Division 6 and the commercial base zone regulations for eating and drinking establishments in SDMC Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 4 and apply to all properties within the Commercial Activity area, inclusive of the Hillcrest Historic District, as shown in Figure 12-5. The purpose of these SDRs is for new development to provide disclosure to prospective buyers and renters within the Commercial Activity Area shown on Figure 12-5 regarding potential noise associated with eating and drinking establishments, while allowing for those uses to operate within or abutting a development with residential uses.

**SDR-D.1 Commercial Activity Area Hours of Operation**

Eating and drinking establishments with a sidewalk cafe, streetary, or active sidewalk within the Commercial Activity Area shown in Figure 12-5 shall comply with SDMC Chapter 14, Article 1, Division 6 - Sidewalk Cafes, Streetaries, and Active Sidewalks regulations except where the following regulations apply.

1. An eating and drinking establishment with a sidewalk cafe, streetary, or active sidewalk shall limit the hours of operation of the sidewalk cafe, streetary, or active sidewalk to the hours the establishment’s kitchen facility is open for meal ordering. In no case shall an eating and drinking establishment with a sidewalk cafe, streetary, or active sidewalk operate any uses or activities within a sidewalk cafe, streetary and active sidewalk during the following times:

   a. Before 7:00 a.m. and after 11:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday; and

   b. Before 7:00 a.m. and and after 12:00 midnight Friday through Saturday and the day prior to a City holiday.
Editor note: This is a new appendix to the Uptown Community Plan
TABLE E-1: NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC RESOURCES IN UPTOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
<th>REFERENCE No.</th>
<th>HISTORIC NAME</th>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
<th>PROPERTY TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2121 1st Avenue</td>
<td>82002245</td>
<td>The Hawthorne Inn</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commercial - Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408 1st Avenue</td>
<td>76000516</td>
<td>Long-Waterman House</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214-2224 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>84001181</td>
<td>Major Myles Molan House</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>83001227</td>
<td>The Coulter Residence</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2825 5th Avenue</td>
<td>83003432</td>
<td>Park Place Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3525 7th Avenue</td>
<td>74000552</td>
<td>George Marston House</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563 7th Avenue</td>
<td>86002665</td>
<td>Frederick R. Burnham House</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4345 Campus Avenue</td>
<td>98001193</td>
<td>Teacher Training School Building</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3141 Curlew Street</td>
<td>87000621</td>
<td>A.H. Sweet Residences</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 West Spruce Street</td>
<td>87000621</td>
<td>A.H. Sweet Residences</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836 E Washington Street</td>
<td>78000750</td>
<td>Chaplain's Residence</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>100007226</td>
<td>Inspiration Heights Subdivision</td>
<td>1909-1961</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should site source of these listings.
## TABLE E.10E.2: CITY OF SAN DIEGO REGISTER INDIVIDUAL HISTORIC RESOURCES IN UPTOWN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY ADDRESS</th>
<th>HRB SITE No.</th>
<th>HISTORIC NAME</th>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930 1st Avenue</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Sherman Judson House</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121 1st Avenue</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>The Hawthorne Inn</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2169 1st Avenue</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Nason Residence</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408 1st Avenue</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Long-Waterman House</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2508 1st Avenue</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Timken House</td>
<td>1887-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2961 1st Avenue</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>John Henry and Katherine Zitt House</td>
<td>c.1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535 1st Avenue</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>Century Plaza Towers/William Krisel Condominiums</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3821 1st Avenue</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>Herbert and Ira Howe House</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 &amp; 2800 Blocks 1st Avenue</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>First Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3718-3724 1st Avenue</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Hall-Sherman House</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045-4075 1st Avenue</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>4045, 4053, 4057, 4069, 4075 1st Avenue</td>
<td>1907-1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>H.E. Watts House</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Broderick-Kenny House</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2331 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>George Keating Residence</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2341 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>Albert and Rebecca Zundelowitz House</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2355 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>E.B. and Martha Stuart House</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2368 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>The Charlotte Bushnell House</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2442 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>First Church of Christ Scientist</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2670 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Hiram Newton Savage House</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2765 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Emmett G. O'Neill Residence</td>
<td>1924-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2928 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>Edith Hawley House</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3130 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>Emily Hill Wadsworth House</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3155 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Theodosia B. Conner Spec House #1</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>The Coulter Residence</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3223 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>George F. Hopkins House</td>
<td>c.1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3225 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Wood/Forney Residence</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Otis Residence</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Mertzmann-Winans Residence</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>John and Mary Gallagher Residence</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3320 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>William and Eleanor McCaskey House</td>
<td>C. 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214-2224 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Major Myles Molan House</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>McCormick/Hartfield Timberlak Christian House</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>Carl and Mary Lundquist House</td>
<td>ca. 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Hazard Residence</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>Elinor Meadows Apartment Building</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3140 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>Irvin and Vitulia Randall House</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>The L. M. Earnhart House</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>William Mason Fortescue Residence</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3518 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Day's Little House</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3557 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>Alfred LaMotte/Hurlburt and Tifal House</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3565 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>John and Evelyn Rice/ Arthur Keyes House</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3576 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Brookes Family House</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3695 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Hardey House</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY ADDRESS</td>
<td>HRB SITE No.</td>
<td>HISTORIC NAME</td>
<td>YEAR BUILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 Torrance Street</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>Sarah Brock/William Templeton Johnson House</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614 Torrance Street</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Brown/Lester Olmstead House</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674 Torrance Street</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>A.W. Woods Spec House #1</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Torrance Street</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>Delawie #1/Boxcar House</td>
<td>1958-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4267 Trias Street</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>John &amp; Emilie Wahrenberger/William Wahrenberger Spec House #1</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4276 Trias Street</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>Olmstead Building Company Spec House #1</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4277 Trias Street</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>William and Grace Wahrenberger House</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4285 Trias Street</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>Frances Herrick/William Wahrenberger House</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352 Trias Street</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>The Irvine and Flora Schulman House</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4356 Trias Street</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>Clarence &amp; Gertrude Beatty/Wayne McAllister House</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4370 Trias Street</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>John Snyder/Ralph E. Hurlburt and Charles H. Tifal Spec House #2</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4386 Trias Street</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>John Snyder/Ralph E. Hurlburt and Charles H. Tifal Spec House #3</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4405 Trias Street</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>Frank and Mary Ricker House</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460 Trias Street</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>William Templeton Johnson/ Harry Brawner Rental House</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4496 Trias Street</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Dr. Charles and Nancy Rees/ William Wahrenberger House</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4498 Trias Street</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Ben and Ruth Rubin House</td>
<td>1949-1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4520 Trias Street</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>William Templeton Johnson House</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240 Trias Street</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>Earnest Hausen and James Hutchins Spec House #1</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2430 Union Street</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>Fred W. Osburn House</td>
<td>c.1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2470 Union Street</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>The Tucker House</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513-2515 Union Street</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>Truax House</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3032 Union Street</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>The Depietri/Pecoraro/Tarantino House</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065 Union Street</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>Napoleon J. Roy House</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041-1047 University Avenue</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>Charles Jurman Building</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412-414 University Avenue</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Jimmy Wong's Golden Dragon Neon Sign</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-803 University Avenue</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>St. Joseph's Hospital Annex/Furniture Store</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3957-3957 W. University Avenue Goldfinch Street</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Charles and Mary Schaeffer Residence/Fred Bushman Building</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 W. Upas Street</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Del Prado/William Krisel Condominiums</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212 W. Upas Street</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Casa De Tempo/Samuel Wood Hamill House</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 W. Upas Street</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Evangeline Caven Bungalow</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4346 Valle Vista Way</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>Richard and Viola Requa House</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3419 Vermont Street</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>George J. Singer House</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-808 W. Washington Place</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>John W. Willmott Hardware/Florence Apartment Building</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302 Washington Place</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Melhorn-King Residence</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 Washington Place</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calvary Cemetery Site</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836 E. Washington Street</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Chaplain's Residence</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925 W. Washington Street</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Mission Hills Branch Public Library</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3725 Willborn Street</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>Irving and Anna Brockett House</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4231 Witherby Street</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>The Jeanette E. &amp; George R. Daley House</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4245 Witherby Street</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>Marshall Cassidy House</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330 Witherby Street</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>Cornelius and Eva Lee Kelly Spec House #1</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table includes all properties designated by the Historical Resources Board as individually significant properties as of February 2016.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>THEME(S)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE HRB CRITERION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart of Banker's Hill Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Avenue, First Avenue, Redwood Street and Dove Street</td>
<td>125 Properties</td>
<td>1870-1940</td>
<td>Early History: 1769-1885; The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909; The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929; Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948</td>
<td>A, C &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton's Addition Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Laurel Street, 4th Avenue, Grape Street and Brant Street</td>
<td>143 Properties</td>
<td>1871-1940</td>
<td>Early History: 1769-1885; The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909; The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929; Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948</td>
<td>A, C &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration Heights Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Sunset Boulevard, Saint James Place, Putterbaugh Street and Couts Street</td>
<td>84 Properties</td>
<td>1887 and 1909-1942</td>
<td>The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909; The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929; Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948</td>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration View Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Torrance Street, Ostego Drive, Walnut Avenue and Eagle Street</td>
<td>24 Properties</td>
<td>1925-1936</td>
<td>The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929; Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948</td>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sherman Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Grape Street, First Avenue, Fir Street and Front Street</td>
<td>12 Properties</td>
<td>1880-1915</td>
<td>Early History: 1769-1885; The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909; The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929</td>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston Family Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Brookes Avenue, Highway 163, Upas Street and the alley between 6th and 7th Avenues</td>
<td>11 Properties</td>
<td>1904-1918</td>
<td>The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909; The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929</td>
<td>A, B, C &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston Hills Potential Historic District</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Avenue, Highway 163, Upas Street and Richmond and Vermont Streets</td>
<td>88 Properties</td>
<td>1924-1940</td>
<td>The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929; Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948</td>
<td>A, B, C &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY ADDRESS</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>YEAR BUILT</td>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td>STATUS CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3762 10th Ave</td>
<td>45209337</td>
<td>c.1900</td>
<td>Victorian Vernacular/transitional Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3768 10th Ave</td>
<td>45209337</td>
<td>c.1900</td>
<td>Victorian Vernacular/transitional Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621 1st Ave</td>
<td>45270503</td>
<td>c.1915</td>
<td>Prairie Apartment Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3853 1st Ave</td>
<td>45205503</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Mission Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4080 1st Ave</td>
<td>44449231</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350 2nd Ave</td>
<td>53318210</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922 3rd Ave</td>
<td>53328207</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Mission Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350 3rd Ave</td>
<td>53318310</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Mission Revival Apartment Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409 3rd Ave</td>
<td>53310604</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Mission Revival Apartment Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3149 3rd Ave</td>
<td>45262121</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3802 3rd Ave</td>
<td>45205523</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Mission Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3947 3rd Ave</td>
<td>44466205</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235 4th Ave</td>
<td>45255528</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245 4th Ave</td>
<td>45255529</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3542 4th Ave</td>
<td>45240211</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937 5th Ave</td>
<td>53329303</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Spanish Eclectic Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 5th Ave</td>
<td>53329302</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Spanish Eclectic Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3433 5th Ave</td>
<td>45240719</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Mission Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3558 5th Ave</td>
<td>45240618</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3517 6th Ave</td>
<td>45243006</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3655 6th Ave</td>
<td>45229104</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3924 8th Ave</td>
<td>44468311</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Apartment Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3720 10th Ave</td>
<td>45210358</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court/Colonial Revival</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4260 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44529223</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4457 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44520107</td>
<td>c.1915</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4462 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44519027</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Mission Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4532 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44511221</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4583 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44512101</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4617 Campus Ave</td>
<td>44503308</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3925 Centre St</td>
<td>44564207</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235 Cleveland Ave</td>
<td>44561003</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4145 Cleveland Ave</td>
<td>44547006</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4550 Cleveland Ave</td>
<td>44511127</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601 Columbia St</td>
<td>53305106</td>
<td>c.1910</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515 Columbia St</td>
<td>45146405</td>
<td>c.1915</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708 Columbia St</td>
<td>45159111</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3716 Columbia St</td>
<td>45159109</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414 Essex St</td>
<td>45219121</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Vernacular Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3756 Front St</td>
<td>45201421</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial Revival Bungalow Court</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY ADDRESS</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>PROPERTY TYPE</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION/SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3701 1st Avenue 104-118 Pennsylvania Ave</td>
<td>4520630700</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>Neighborhood Revitalization and the LGBTQ Community: 1970-Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3935 1st Avenue</td>
<td>444610900</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Priority Pharmacy: Known for its business and charitable efforts on behalf of people with AIDS. The company's founder, pharmacist David C. Zeiger, is said to have filled San Diego's first private prescription for the AIDS-fighting drug AZT in 1987.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3760 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>4520613600</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3794 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>4520552000</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3956-3958 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>444612000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>LGBTQ business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3775-3779 4th Avenue</td>
<td>4520561200</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>LGBTQ business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3833 4th Avenue</td>
<td>4520560500</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Bob Kaufman Tuxedo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3867 4th Avenue</td>
<td>4520560200</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Gay Alano Club: A support group for people who felt shunned by the church. Meeting place for the first gay pride.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3971 4th Avenue 401-415 University Ave</td>
<td>4520560100</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>LGBTQ business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3845 5th Avenue</td>
<td>4520560200</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Brass Rail: Gay bar. Initiated Hillcrest as the gay section. In the original Hillcrest site of the Brass Rail also stood The Center and The Gay Archives and the first house for patients with AIDS help set up by Kate Johnson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3969-3972 5th Avenue</td>
<td>444671800</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Possibly the location of the first gay bar in Hillcrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3909 Centre Street</td>
<td>4456411000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>The Center: Home to the LGBT Center since 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3910-3916 Normal Street</td>
<td>4456201600</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>The Center: Home to the LGBT Center 1992-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3780 Park Boulevard</td>
<td>4520200500</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>The Flame: Lesbian bar. Formerly an old supper club on Park Blvd (Named after a fire that destroyed the first restaurant, The Garden of Allah).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513-2515 Union Street</td>
<td>5330721800</td>
<td>Residential / Commercial</td>
<td>Truax House: Possibly the first AIDS Hospice in San Diego.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 University Avenue</td>
<td>444661000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Tin Pan Alley: Gay bar (now Urban Mo's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013-1017 University Ave</td>
<td>4521562000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Flicks: (1017 University Avenue) One of San Diego's first video bars, opened around the same time as The Flame.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-127 University Ave</td>
<td>4520551000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>LGBTQ business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-242 University Ave</td>
<td>444612700</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>LGBTQ business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029 University Avenue</td>
<td>4521561800</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Obelisk: First place you could get academic information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051 University Avenue</td>
<td>4521561500</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Dillon's and Mickey Finn's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271 University Avenue</td>
<td>4521513000</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Peacock Alley: Gay bar (now Ruby Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421 University Avenue</td>
<td>4521910200</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Show Biz Supper Club: First female impersonations, similar to &quot;Lips.&quot; It was entertainment for everyone; it was not just for gays, although it was a huge part of the gay community. First drag place that paid people to perform and home of the first African American drag performer. Tourists from Mission Valley are bused to the club for three shows a night. The stage goes dark in 1982.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue, just west of 5th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revitalized by the LGBTQ community in 1984.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11-0E-8: POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS IDENTIFIED DURING PUBLIC OUTREACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>THEME(S)</th>
<th>POSSIBLE HRB CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Allen Terrace Potential Historic District | Allen Terrace Subdivision, including the north side of Altamira Place, 4403-4499 Hermosa Way, 4404-4444 Valle Vista, and Teralta Place | 35 Parcels | 1915-1958 | • The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929  
• Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948  
• Postwar Development, Suburbanization, the Automobile, & Modernism: 1948-1970 | C          |
| Avalon Heights Potential Historic District | Avalon Heights Subdivision, as well as portions of Florence Heights Unit No 2 and Franklin Court, including Avalon Drive, Arcadia Drive, Summit Place, 4296-4395 Hawk Street and 921, 932 and 947 Court Way | 53 Parcels | 1914-1958 | • The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929  
• Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948  
• Postwar Development, Suburbanization, the Automobile, & Modernism: 1948-1970 | C          |
| Hillcrest                  | Washington Street to the north, 6th Avenue to the east, Pennsylvania Avenue to the south, and 1st Avenue to the west | 265 Parcels | 1895-2000 | • The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909  
• The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929  
• Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948  
• Postwar Development, Suburbanization, the Automobile, & Modernism: 1948-1970  
• Neighborhood Revitalization and the LGBTQ Community: 1970-Present | A, C       |
| San Diego Normal School/San Diego City Schools Education Complex | Meade Avenue to the north, Park Boulevard to the east, Normal Street to the south, and Campus Avenue to the west | 1 Parcel   | 1898/1910-1953 | • The Railroad Boom and Early Residential Development: 1885-1909  
• The Panama-California Exposition and Streetcar Suburbs: 1909-1929  
• Great Depression and World War II: 1929-1948  
• Postwar Development, Suburbanization, the Automobile, & Modernism: 1948-1970 | A, C, D    |

There should be a key to these HRB Criteria.

This should be referenced as from the Uptown Planning effort??
FIGURE E-1103: LOCATION OF POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS IDENTIFIED IN THE UPTOWN HISTORIC RESOURCE RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY
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Our property is not in a historic district
FIGURE E-2110-4: LOCATION OF POTENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS IDENTIFIED DURING PUBLIC OUTREACH
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- Community Plan Boundary

Our property is not in a historic district
Hello-

Thank you for considering this 22-year residence's opinion. Please DO NOT move forward with the plan to double Hillcrest/University Heights neighborhoods. The construction and added traffic in the area is already out of control, and we are losing our 'neighborhood feel'.

I hate what is happening to my beloved neighborhood.

Thank you- Kendall Chelquist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Agenda Item Number</th>
<th>Position of Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>I strongly support the proposed amendment to the Uptown Community Plan. I think the plan hillcrest team has done a great job of balancing the desire to retain our traditional residential neighborhoods while focusing growth in the Hillcrest commercial district. The urbanization of this area will revitalize the area, bring in new residents, support new and retained affordable housing and provide mobility and places for people to play and gather. The new LGBTQ cultural and entertainment district approach preserves that which is critical, the record of people, places and events which made the community what it is and lays out a path to support the LGBTQ businesses in the area. I strongly urge you to approve this proposed amendment to make uptown and Hillcrest a more vibrant walkable and livable community for all.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_989827/40094/plan-hillcrest-comments-1-may-2024.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Gehl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>The proposed Plan Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Cultural District would be the most effective way of supporting the City of San Diego’s Strategies Plan objective of “Celebrating the cultural diversity and history of the LGBTQ+ community.” The Cultural District will use effective ways of communicating ideas such as words, written and spoken, pictures and color. It would also include a walking corridor that would link cultural interpretive elements and facilitate walking tours, another effective way to communicate ideas. Identifying and preserving historic resources and districts on the other hand has proven to not only be ineffective in communicating cultural ideas in San Diego; it has done damage to the city by preventing much needed new multifamily housing, lowering property values, and hurting the city’s tax base.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_989827/40096/plan-hillcrest-comments-2-may-2024.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Gehl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>Remove policy HP-2.1 from Uptown Plan. There is a huge mistake on page HP-233 of the Uptown Community Plan Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, March 2024 Draft. Under Policies, HP-2.1 calls for “interim protection” for potential historic districts. Interim protections were voted down by the city council in 2016, because they could create serious legal problems. They should not still be in the Uptown, North Park, and Greater Golden Hill Community Plans eight years later.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_989827/40096/plan-hillcrest-comments-2-may-2024.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Gehl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>Need more maps in Historic section. The Historic Preservation section of the Uptown Plan should include maps showing the locations of all of the current Existing and Potential Historic Properties and Districts, including the Multiple Property Listings. The maps in the section show only the Designated and Potential Historic Districts, which gives a false idea of how the proposal to designating some 4,000 properties would affect Uptown’s property values, tax base, and potential for new housing.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_989827/40096/plan-hillcrest-comments-2-may-2024.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Gehl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Remove policy HP-2.1 from Uptown Plan. There is a huge mistake on page HP-233 of the Uptown Community Plan Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, March 2024 Draft. Under Policies, HP-2.1 calls for “interim protection” for potential historic districts. Interim protections were voted down by the city council in 2016, because they could create serious legal problems. They should not still be in the Uptown, North Park, and Greater Golden Hill Community Plans eight years later.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gibson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Amendment to the uptown plan outlines the concerns of people who live in these areas. Our neighborhoods are being sold off to developers in the name of the need for more affordable housing. The projects being built are not an answer. Hillcrest is an expensive area in which to live and it is not just the housing; groceries, and stores are also expensive! Where will our drug stores, our grocery stores, hardware, etc. be? Those basic places that make a neighborhood walkable and serve its citizens. You will say they will be on the ground level, but I ask, at what costs, as those spaces will be more expensive for the stores, consequently for the people who shop there. In addition the lack of planning for infrastructure mediation is lacking. Traffic is already at grid-lock, bus routes are insufficient/un-efficient and the sky is disappearing, making the sidewalk view overwhelming by human scale. In the last 3 years, three 7-story Soviet gulag style buildings have been built in an area with a 60' height limit, a limit approved and recommended by the people who live in these areas and ignored by the city. ADOPT THIS AMENDMENT!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Kaminski</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are only two choices. I have selected “in opposition” as the comments reflect concerns about some of the elements of Chapter 5 LGBTQ Culture and Chapter 11 Historic Preservation. Please see attached letter from the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patric Stillman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>As a small business owner of The Studio Door art gallery, I am in full support of the LGBT Cultural District designation that comes with the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The designation is a foundational cornerstone that will ensure protections for LGBTQ+ nightlife establishments through sound accommodations in new constructions and wayfinding elements. The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment balances new housing development with preserving LGBTQ+ culture by supporting mixed housing and safeguarding LGBTQ+ businesses and safe spaces. Preserving Hillcrest’s character involves protecting its uses, not just buildings, and developing the DMV property to promote diverse housing options. I stand in support of all these elements, which will provide a path for the neighborhood’s future while ensuring our cultural use is preserved. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW PUBLIC COMMENT ADDED @ 5:00 PM - MAY 28, 2024
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Support of Item</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Friedt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>We need protections for The LGBTQ+ Cultural District now more than ever! The LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide real protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife establishments in the form of regulations that provide for accommodations in the following areas: noise protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife safe spaces, expanded hours (including on patios), wayfinding and decorative elements throughout the district, and protections for legacy businesses. Balancing new housing development and preserving our LGBTQ+ culture is important and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment does this. We don't want to preserve just buildings. The right way to protect the LGBTQ+ community in Hillcrest, we want to protect the uses that have made Hillcrest what it is. We also need to develop the DMV property, which has remained an eyesore in our vibrant community, by promoting a mix of housing options for a mix of people, including seniors and youth. This can be accomplished through the adoption of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Countless hours of outreach both in person and online, has resulted in a REAL community focused update. I urge you to vote yes!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Morgan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I support the Hillcrest Plan Amendment. The level of community engagement and outreach organized by the Planning Team and the City of San Diego Planning Department to collect community input through a variety of mechanisms for the HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT was robust. Long-term housing, mobility, and public spaces planning require a wide lens to be representative of the community’s past, present, and future. The diversity of input, the breadth of outreach, and the coverage across residents, employees, and visitors all come together to form a foundation for a HILLCREST FOCUSED PLAN AMENDMENT rooted in the credibility of primary research. The Planning Team made me feel like my input mattered - and it was great to see value-added feedback actually taken into account in the plan. I personally participated through the online community survey in 2020 and choose your future hillcrest platform in 2022, as well as community discussions in 2023, office hours at the Knox Library in 2024, and was equally impressed with general outreach to collect community input through Community Meeting Announcements, Emails &amp; Newsletters, Tabling at Public Events, Business Canvassing, Social Media, Mailers, Local News, and Email Coordination with other Community Partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Hueter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In order to reduce the current contention between historic preservation and redevelopment, we recommend that additional policies be added to the Historic Preservation Element of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment: Proposed additional policy: HP-3.7 Emphasize adaptive reuse rather than destruction of historic buildings, thereby reducing landfill construction waste and ensuring compatibility with surrounding buildings. Proposed additional policy: HP-3.8 Collaborate with community planning groups and historic districts to define neighborhood design standards, which will set expectations for both developers and community members and reduce contention over projects. Proposed additional policy: HP-3.9 Create community centering places around historic resources. Proposed additional policy: HP-3.10 Enhance pedestrian access and enjoyment of commercial historic districts through better sidewalks, including shade trees. The rationale for these proposed policies is detailed in the attached document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carol Emerick

4 In Opposition to Item

The Mobility plan in HFPA negatively impacts residents of Cleveland Heights. People living south of University Ave, west of First Ave, north and south of Robinson, will need to travel in circles to find their way home. Residents of Cleveland Heights, will be required to drive around several blocks, causing additional congestion in Hillcrest. How will Florence Canyon, at the north end of Cleveland Heights, be impacted by plans to create a commuter light rail system along University Ave in addition to the wider sidewalks, promenades, bicycle and car lanes????? In the Report to Planning Commission, May 23, 2024 mobility is addressed on page 8.

E. Couplet System and Dedicated Transit Lanes

What does this mean? Please explain Couplet System.

d. Transit

The HFPA will revise the recommended transit network to be consistent with SANDAG 2021 Regional Plan. Please be specific about what this means. Exactly where and how will this transit line be placed on University Avenue?

With the increased density in Hillcrest, more cars will be parking on the streets in neighborhoods bordering Hillcrest. Currently there is very little parking available for service workers, gardeners, housekeepers, painters, plumbers, exterminators. Yes, there are rats that need to be controlled.

Kevin Sanders

4 In Support of Item

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide noise protections for out LGBTQ+ nightlife safe spaces, expanded hours (including on patios), way-finding and decorative elements throughout the district, and protections for legacy businesses. Without these, many LGBTQ+ Safe Havens will not be able to survive as has been witnessed countless other LGBTQ communities across the country that went through the same process. San Diego can lead by the right example for how to protects LGBTQ plus businesses properly as we increase density and grow our community/city.

Preserving buildings isn't the right way to protect the LGBTQ+ community in Hillcrest. We have to protect the uses that have made Hillcrest what it is. The LGBTQ+ Cultural District does this by protecting our safe spaces and housing options.

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide real protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife establishments in the form of regulations that provide for accommodations in new construction relating to sound and provisions for way finding to signal to people they're in the cultural district. 

Balancing new housing development and preserving our LGBTQ+ culture is important and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment does this by providing for mixed housing with protections for the LGBTQ+ business community.

Thank you!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Support/Opposition</th>
<th>In Support of Item</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Kappel</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>I am strongly in favor of anything the city can do to increase density and provide more housing options. We have 6 times the population we had in 1947 yet have not built nearly enough housing. Building near transit to help us reach our climate goals also makes sense. It’s time for new attitudes in San Diego - more density, more public transit - to become the World Class City we want to be. It would be great if some of the housing can be condos/opportunity for ownership as owning Southern California real estate is a clear path to building wealth and financial security and housing security. So many of the projects are luxury apartments and we need more condo developments and options for those who want to own homes. I am also in favor of ensuring the infrastructure is in place to handle the population with more parks, stores, transit options, bike lanes, walkable sidewalks and communities. Let’s truly become “America’s Finest City” by providing more housing and urban infrastructure for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ziebarth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opposition is to 5% Public Space Requirement. One of the Code Monitoring Team’s and 2000 Land Development Code Update’s missions was to Eliminate redundancy and contradictions in development regulations. The SDRs in University City and Hillcrest Updates create inconsistencies between the two Updates. University City creates contradictions with the municipal code. Hillcrest references the municipal code versus tweaking existing regulations. SDRs in the Hillcrest Update are appropriately far less specific in its regulations than the University City Update. Why is there a different approach between the two Updates? The requirement for 5% public spaces is unprecedented within the city, but also in the country. Only San Francisco and Seattle require Public Open Space (POS) and that pertains to office buildings over a certain size in areas like downtown or the Amazon Corporate Headquarters. New York does not require POS, but incentivizes POS with additional development rights. Residential and Retail are exempt in all cases. The 5% of area required for public space in the Update exceeds the criteria of Seattle and San Francisco by 250% to 500%. Consider reducing the percentage to 1 or 2% and not requiring it for residential and retail consistent with Seattle and San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Support of Item</td>
<td>Please support the Cultural District! The LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife establishments in the form of regulations that provide for accommodations in new construction relating to sound and provisions for wayfinding to signal to people they’re in the cultural district. LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide noise protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife safe spaces, expanded hours (including on patios), wayfinding and decorative elements throughout the district, and protections for legacy businesses. Balancing new housing development and preserving our LGBTQ+ culture is important and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment does this by providing for mixed housing with protections for the LGBTQ+ business community. Preserving buildings is not the right way to protect the LGBTQ+ community in Hillcrest. We have to protect the uses that have made Hillcrest what it is. The LGBTQ+ Cultural District does this by protecting our safe spaces and housing options. We need to develop a mix of housing options for a variety of people and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment helps in achieving this goal. Thank you-Richard Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PUBLIC COMMENT ADDED @ 6:30 AM 5/30/2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see the Chatten-Brown Law Group letter prepared on behalf of the San Diego Sierra Club.

The Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, along with the University Community Plan Update, are evaluated in a single draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Blueprint SD Initiative. The PEIR fails to fully analyze, disclose, and mitigate impacts to greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travelled, relying on transit that doesn’t currently exist.

The PEIR claims it obviates the need for environmental review of future community plan updates, land use code changes, and related projects, yet simultaneously states it cannot incorporate any mitigation measures due to the fact it is a programmatic EIR. The PEIR proposes no specific mitigation for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The City has failed to secure the required long-term funding mechanism for MSCP implementation. Thus, we urge the City to incorporate a funding mechanism as a mitigation measure, especially given that it admits there will be increased strain on the City’s existing open space systems. And despite this admission, the PEIR avoids meaningful analysis of impacts to resource-based parks and fails to provide any mitigation, on the grounds that it is only conducting a program-level review.

PUBLIC COMMENT - ADDED @ 10:30 AM 5/30/2024
May 24th, 2024

To Whom It May Concern,

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the city and the dedicated planning department staff for their tireless efforts on Plan Hillcrest. We are thrilled to see the comprehensive changes that will benefit our community.

In particular, the inclusion of the LGBTQ district, the updates to land use that will welcome more neighbors, and the improvements to the transportation network aimed at enhancing safety are especially exciting. These forward-thinking changes reflect a commitment to creating a more inclusive and safer community, which we fully support.

Vibrant Uptown held two town halls during the development process of Plan Hillcrest, with 200 Uptown residents attending to discuss and comment on the LGBTQ+ Cultural District and the overall draft. All comments received were provided to the planning department. Upon reviewing this third draft of the plan, we are excited to see many of the comments from those attendees included. It is gratifying to see that the authors are listening to the voice of the community as this moves forward.

We recommend the commission approve the changes proposed in Plan Hillcrest and we look forward to seeing the positive impact these developments will have on our community.

Best,

Jon Anderson

Founding Member
Vibrant Uptown
Comments on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment May 25, 2024 draft to the Uptown Community Plan

Sharon Gehl slgehl2000@gmail.com

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District is a better way to tell history

The proposed Plan Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Cultural District would be the most effective way of supporting the City of San Diego’s Strategies Plan objective of “Celebrating the cultural diversity and history of the LGBTQ+ community”.

The Cultural District will use effective ways of communicating ideas such as words, written and spoken, pictures and color. It would also include a walking corridor that would link cultural interpretive elements and facilitate walking tours, another effective way to communicate ideas.

Identifying and preserving historic resources and districts on the other hand has proven to not only be ineffective in communicating cultural ideas in San Diego; it has done damage to the city by preventing much needed new multifamily housing, lowering property values, and hurting the city’s tax base.

Society tends to pay for the things that we find work. Most of us learned the main points of history in school, from reading a book or newspaper, or from watching things like a Ken Burns documentary. While we pay teachers, writers, and producers to tell us about history, most people are not interested in spending money on historic buildings. All City of San Diego, San Diego County, and California state historic buildings lose money. Why does the new Hillcrest Plan Amendment propose designating more buildings when people aren’t interested in the ones we already have? What is going on?

The key to understanding Historic Preservation is this Wikipedia entry on the subject. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historic_preservation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historic_preservation) Wikipedia defines Historic Preservation as a “philosophical concept”. The concept/theory was that turning buildings into museums would be a good way to tell history. This theory has been tested in the US for over a hundred years. It was soon evident that turning buildings into museums is not an effective or popular way to tell history. The theory was wrong.

The overwhelming majority of historic museums lose money, because they don’t have enough customers to support them. If you had a restaurant that didn’t have enough customers, it would go out of business; but professional preservationists asked for donations big and small, for volunteers to work for free, and for taxpayer money to bail their museums out.

Despite the taxpayer money and private donations, it was still difficult for professional preservationists to make money from historic museums. Then about 50 years ago preservationists found that they could make money by getting laws passed that allowed them...
to get control of other people’s property - without having to compensate the owners financially.

As the chart below from the Wikipedia entry shows, now the majority of jobs in US historic preservation are not in Museums, 9%; but in Regulatory Compliance, 70%. In other words, managing the laws and regulations that control officially designated or proposed historic properties. The more properties the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board (HRB) designates, either by force of law or because owners want big Mills Act tax subsidies, the more money professional preservationists in San Diego make. Adding more and more proposed properties to community plans is also a way for professional preservationists to make more money.

| Areas of professional, paid practice in historic preservation in the United States[6] |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Area of practice                              | ! Percent (out of 100%) |
| Regulatory compliance (federal, state, and local) | 69.7%            |
| Architecture and construction                 | 11.2%            |
| Historic sites/museums                        | 8.9%             |
| Preservation advocacy                         | 5.7%             |
| Downtown revitalization                       | 4.5%             |

Appendix E of the Uptown Community Plan lists over 525 Individually and District Designated properties, 17 Potential Historic Districts with some 2678 properties, 4 potential Multi-property Districts with some 953 properties, and 44 Potential Individually Listed properties. If the city already has over 500 designated properties that lower the city’s tax base and the majority of people ignore, why do we need another 3,500 to “tell history”?

The problem is that the City of San Diego’s historic preservation program is not actually about telling history, supporting the city’s climate action plan, social equity, or increasing our housing supply and tax base; it’s about using laws to allow professional preservationists to get control of as much property as possible. The proof is the extremely boring DRAFT Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment LGBTQ+ Historic Context Statement. LGBTQ+ history is actually quite interesting, but that Context Statement isn’t about telling history, it’s about establishing a legal basis for getting control of property that will hold up in court if the city is sued.

To summarize, the majority of Americans do not find historical preservation a good way to learn about history, it is therefore not financially viable; which makes it difficult for professional
preservationists to make money. They solved their problem by getting laws passed. Now the overwhelming majority of them make money from taxpayer subsidies and government laws that give them control of other people’s properties without paying for them, not from using buildings to tell history.

Buildings are particularly bad at telling cultural history, even if that was actually the city’s intent. Buildings are just objects that say nothing. They need verbal, written, and/or visual explanations; which are more effective and less expensive than using buildings. The solution is to take all of the proposed historic properties and districts out of the Uptown and Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The proposed Cultural District can talk about culture and history more effectively and for less money than designating buildings. A Cultural District can also evolve over time to keep up with changing needs and new LGBTQ+ history.

Do what is best for the majority of people in San Diego, not what is best for a handful of preservationists. Support the City’s climate action goals, it’s housing needs, and social equity.
Comments on the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment May 25, 2024 draft to the Uptown Community Plan

Sharon Gehl  slgehl2000@gmail.com

Remove policy HP-2.1 from Uptown Plan

There is a huge mistake on page HP-233 of the Uptown Community Plan Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment, March 2024 Draft. Under Policies, HP-2.1 calls for “interim protection” for potential historic districts. Interim protections were voted down by the city council in 2016, because they could create serious legal problems. They should not still be in the Uptown, North Park, and Greater Golden Hill Community Plans eight years later.

Policies

HP-2.1  Provide interim protection of potential historic districts until such time as they can be intensively surveyed, verified, and brought forward for Historic Designation consistent with City regulations and procedures.

New historic regulations to “Provide interim protection” were in an “overly Zone” which were part of the proposed Uptown, North Park, and Greater Golden Hill Community Plan Updates in 2016. They would have treated all 26 proposed historic districts in the three communities as if they were already actual legal historic districts, without first spending millions of dollars to do the research needed to see if any of the proposed districts met the legal standards, present them to community groups, and then HRB. This would have affected thousands of properties.

City staff said at a recent Planning Commission meeting that interim protection of potential historic districts was just something that was discussed as part of the three 2016 community plan updates, not actual legal regulations that were part of the plan. But that isn’t true.

Attached are the 2016 “Potential Historic District Overlay Zone” regulations, that would “provide interim protection measures to guard against loss of the overall integrity of potential historic districts identified through survey evaluation and their eligibility for designation as a historic district.” These Overlay Zones were presented to the Planning groups in each community and then to the HRB, which recommended that the Planning Commission approve them.

A cursory survey evaluation is not sufficient to establish eligibility for designation, and yet the new regulations would have forced designation on thousands of properties without doing the research and taking all legal steps necessary for designation in the City of San Diego. Once
Historic Preservation Planning had control of the properties, there would have been little reason to spend money to “bring that district ...forward for historic designation consistent with the Municipal Code and Historic District Nomination Procedures.” Afterall, they might find if they did the proper research that the potential district did not actually meet the requirements to be a district.

As an example, the residents of one of the listed potential historic districts in 2016, Presidio Hills, were able to spend the time and money to show that enough of the properties listed as potential contributors to that district by an old drive-by survey, did not actually qualify because of past remodels that made major changes the front of the homes. Without those properties, the potential district did not have enough contributors to qualify as a district, and was taken out of the Uptown Plan by the City Council when the Uptown Plan was voted on.

These proposed new regulations were actually stricter than the existing regulations for historic districts at the time. They said “No modifications or additions to an existing single dwelling unit or multiple dwelling unit structure shall be permitted on the front two-thirds (2/3) of the original building footprint, unless” it was to repair or replace a feature that was or might have been originally there. There were plenty of existing examples at the time of dwelling units that had undergone major additions that were within two-thirds of the original building footprint.

The idea of applying regulations to 26 potential historic districts in the three communities was so egregious that there was a lot of opposition in the Uptown community. Fortunately, a major property owner in Hillcrest, Bennet Greenwald, hired a land use lawyer to talk to the city about the legal problems adopting a Potential Historic District Overlay Zone that covered thousands of properties in three communities would create for the city.

At almost the last moment, those who opposed these regulations found out that they would be voted on by the city council only once, when the North Park Plan was voted on two weeks before the Uptown Plan would go to the Council. If the new regulations had been approved as part of the North Park Plan Update, it would have also applied to the other two community plans as of that date.

Fortunately, the city council took the “interim protection” regulations out of the North Park, Uptown, and Golden Hill Plan Updates eight years ago. The Planning Department should have taken Policy HP-2.1 out of the three plans at the same time. Please take it out of the Uptown Community Plan Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment now.
Chapter 13: Zones

Article 2: Overlay Zones

Division 16: Potential Historic District Overlay Zone

§132.1601 Purpose of the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone

The purpose of the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone is to provide interim protection measures to guard against loss of the overall integrity of potential historic districts identified through survey evaluation and their eligibility for designation as a historic district.

§132.1602 Where the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone Applies

(a) This overlay zone applies to properties within predominantly residential areas that have been identified as potential historic districts through survey evaluation and require supplemental development regulations, and that have been incorporated by ordinance into this overlay zone. Table 132-16A lists the Potential Historic District Overlay Zones and the corresponding rezone maps that indicate which properties are within the boundaries of the overlay zone. These maps are filed in the office of the City Clerk. The properties within this overlay zone are shown generally on Diagrams 132-16A through 132-16Z.

Table 132-16A
Potential Historical District Overlay Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Historic District Overlay Zone</th>
<th>Map Number Showing Boundaries of Potential Historic District Overlay Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th Street Residential (See Diagram 132-16A)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Choate’s (See Diagram 132-16B)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverwell &amp; Taggart’s Addition (See Diagram 132-16C)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove Street (See Diagram 132-16D)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart of Banker’s Hill (See Diagram 132-16E)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton’s Addition (See Diagram 132-16F)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration Heights (See Diagram 132-16G)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration View (See Diagram 132-16H)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sherman (See Diagram 132-16I)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmia Place (See Diagram 132-16J)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine View (See Diagram 132-16K)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston Family (See Diagram 132-16L)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston Hills (See Diagram 132-16M)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills Historic District Expansion (See Diagram 132-16N)</td>
<td>[Insert no. for C or B Sheet]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 132-16B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development Proposal</th>
<th>Supplemental Development Regulations</th>
<th>Required Permit Type/Decision Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Development on a parcel containing a non-contributing resource.</td>
<td>None - Exempt from this division</td>
<td>No permit required by this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Development on a parcel containing only structures less than 45 years old.</td>
<td>None - Exempt from this division</td>
<td>No permit required by this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Development impacting only structures containing non-residential uses.</td>
<td>None - Exempt from this division</td>
<td>No permit required by this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Interior building improvements that do not involve a change in use or provide additional floor area, or improvements that do not require a construction permit in accordance with SDMC 129.0203.</td>
<td>None - Exempt from this division</td>
<td>No permit required by this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Building improvements identified in SDMC 143.0212(a)(1)-(4).</td>
<td>None - Exempt from this division</td>
<td>No permit required by this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Any development within the boundaries shown on a map identified in Section 132.1602, where development complies with Section 132.1603.</td>
<td>Section 132.1603</td>
<td>Construction Permit/Process One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Any development within the boundaries shown on a map identified in Section 132.1602, where development does not comply with Section 132.1603.</td>
<td>Section 132.1603</td>
<td>Neighborhood Development Permit/Process Two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) As the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone is intended to provide only interim protection of potential historic districts, this overlay zone shall be amended to remove a potential historic district once that district is brought forward for historic designation consistent with the Municipal Code and Historic District Nomination Procedures. If the potential historic district is designated by the Historical Resources Board, the historic district would be subject to the requirements of the Historical Resources Regulations. If the potential historic district is found ineligible for designation by the Historical Resources Board, it would be removed from the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone and no further regulation or protection measures would apply.

(d) Individual properties within the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone will continue to be subject to the Historical Resources Regulations found in Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2. This includes designated historical resources, as well as resources determined potentially individually significant under Section 143.0212.

§132.1603 Supplemental Regulations of the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone

Development within the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone on a parcel containing a potential contributing resource shall be subject to review for compliance with the following supplemental regulations.

(a) No modifications or additions to an existing single dwelling unit or multiple dwelling unit structure shall be permitted on the front two-thirds (2/3) of the original building footprint, unless:

(1) The modification proposed will repair existing historic materials consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards; or

(2) The modification proposed will restore the structure to its historic appearance consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards based on photo documentation or the written opinion of a Historic Preservation Architect. The project plans shall include information demonstrating how the modification will result in the restoration of the structure, and a copy of the supporting photo documentation or written opinion shall be included with the application.

§132.1604 Deviations to the Potential Historic District Overlay Zone

An applicant may request to deviate from the supplemental regulations in Section 132.1603 by applying for a Neighborhood Development Permit. Deviations may be approved or conditionally approved with a Neighborhood Development Permit in accordance with a Process Two only if the decision maker makes all of the findings in Section 126.0404(a) and the supplemental findings in Section 126.0404(f).
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project

May 27, 2024

Planning Commission
1222 First Avenue
MS 501San Diego, CA 92101

RE: May 30, 2024 Item 4: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment
Chapter 5: LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation

Chairperson Modén, Vice-Chairperson Boomhower, Commission Members Miyahara, Mahzari, Otsuji and Malbrough,

The San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project (The Project) welcomes this opportunity to offer its comments to the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment regarding Chapter 5: LGBTQ+ Culture and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation components.

The idea of an LGBTQ+ Cultural District (Chapter 5) is a welcome component to the Uptown Plan. However a cultural component should not overshadow specifically designated LGBTQ+ historic sites and potential LGBTQ+ historic sites in the Hillcrest/Uptown Plan area. Designated and potential designated historic sites can be the linkages and the glue that ties past to present to future and form the anchors and threads of interpretive elements that link memory and progress as a cultural district develops over time. By emphasizing signage, interpretative element, colors and graphics, the Cultural District appears to be engaging in “rainbow washing”.

There is no specific language in Chapter 5 that emphasizes the importance of identifying designated historic LGBTQ+ sites (only one) and potentially significant historic LGBTQ+ sites (many). They appear to be identified in Chapter 11: Historic Preservation but a statement must be included in Chapter 5. (Contained in Chapter 11 but should also duplicated in Chapter 5).

The LGBTQ+ Cultural District must have as a goal the preservation, maintenance and promotion of local LGBTQ+ history. Preserving historical assets such as places, buildings, traditions, events, etc. can be found in other cities LGBTQ+ cultural districts. The same should be true for Hillcrest and San Diego.

We concur with the comments received by staff for adding policy support for the adaptive reuse of historically designated LGBTQ+ sites within the LGBTQ+ Cultural District to link the past to the future.
The San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project disagrees with the staff report in this section.

4. Historic Preservation and Cultural Heritage Strategy

The Hillcrest Historic Preservation and Cultural Heritage Strategy complements the LGBTQ+ Cultural District. While cultural districts can co-exist with historic districts, they are not one and the same and serve different purposes. A historic district acknowledges and protects a specified area with a concentration of buildings and sites that collectively embody a significant aspect of the City’s history. A cultural district is not defined by historic significance, but rather is a tool for place-making and place-keeping that honors the presence and contributions of cultural groups while providing support to legacy businesses, nonprofits, community arts, and traditions.

While agreeing with the complementary relationship, LGBTQ places, as well as designated and potentially designated historic sites and buildings do create the guideposts of a cultural district for without those places and buildings, the LGBTQ community would not have persevered and developed into the community the City acknowledges through this plan amendment. As a previously unrecognized community similar to the Latin, Black and Asian communities a cultural district can highlight progress and social and political activism as well as the struggles these communities had to face to begin to achieve the benefits of equal rights.

This concept recognizing the importance of historic sites, places and buildings is spoken of and somewhat reinforced in:

5. LGBTQ+ Cultural Strategy

The draft plan includes an LGBTQ+ Culture element that outlines an LGBTQ+ Cultural District to formally recognize the Hillcrest area for its history, people, events, and culture. Through a thoughtful blend of cultural elements, public spaces, and community initiatives, the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will pay homage to the struggles that have shaped its community and embrace a dynamic present and future.

Commemorate, recognize, and highlight the people, spaces, buildings, events, and physical elements that contribute to the history and culture of the LGBTQ+ community in Hillcrest.

In 5.0 LGBTQ+ Cultural Districts of the Focused Plan Amendment;

This section should specifically state in "Key Objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District” that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. Additionally this section should specifically state that identifying potential
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project

LGBTQ+ historic sites will add additional LGBTQ+ history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops.

The “Key Objectives of the LGBTQ+ Cultural District” should acknowledge, in addition to entertainment and commercial business establishments, the importance of social service agencies and community based organizations as a significant part of LGBTQ+ culture and history.

The San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Projects supports the concept of an historic Hillcrest district that includes the important places and buildings that comprise the LGBTQ community’s meeting places, social locations and businesses. These were and still are important and potentially historic locations where the community became visible, politically active and grew strength from community gatherings and memorials.

Preservation of “important features and historic characteristics” is welcome but appear to be trinkets and more “rainbow washing”. We support the protection of historic street frontages (although we do not fully understand what this exactly means. The Stonewall Inn in New York is a designated National Historic Site yet the façade of the Inn is quite different that what existed in the 1969 riots. The Stonewall Inn is recognized for its event that occurred) and the adaptive reuse of these historic buildings.

E. How will the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment be implemented?

2. Supplemental Development Regulations
Preservation of important features and historic characteristics within the boundary of the proposed Hillcrest Historic District through the protection of historic street frontages…The Hillcrest Historic District CPIOZ boundary aligns with the proposed Hillcrest Historic District, which has been fully evaluated in the Hillcrest Historic District Nomination and found to be significant as the historic commercial core of Hillcrest and for its important association with San Diego’s LGBTQ+ community…The Hillcrest Historic District CPIOZ and associated SDRs will retain important historic features and characteristics of the Hillcrest Historic District while encouraging the continued use and adaptive reuse of these buildings as well as increased development of homes within the Hillcrest core.

Focused Plan Amendment: 5.3 Interpretive Elements

The Project supports the incorporation of interpretive elements and recommends the avoidance of standard plaques and landmarks. At the same time, The Project stresses the avoidance of “rainbow washing” in artwork, buildings, streetscapes, signage, etc. Plaques and installations are secondary to actual physical sites.

Adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, repurposing are options that can integrate old and new. Additionally these sections should specifically state that identifying potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can add additional history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops.
These interpretive elements should utilize a family of components that truly links the district and provides the excitement of the pedestrian and visitor to move from history to entertainment to just celebrating culture of LGBTQ+ Hillcrest. Designated LGBTQ+ historic sites and potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can be used as landmarks that truly tell the story of the community. Locating these interpretative elements at historic sites (both designated and potential) set up a “true rainbow” of linkages and nodes that can become community focal points.

The Cultural District should have a strong financial backed maintenance program to avoid these elements from becoming worn, deteriorated, and graffitified as well as a time line for implementation. If individual businesses are expected to provide these components, we foresee a long “waiting period.”

5.6 POLICY

As previously stated in 5.3, incorporate in CD-2 the Trans, Black, BIPOC, API, Indigenous LGBTQ+ community stories into the LGBTQ+ Cultural District.

As discussed in the comments previously, this section should include and specifically state a policy that designated historic LGBTQ+ sites should be preserved and incorporated in any new development. Additional these sections should specifically state that identifying potential LGBTQ+ historic sites can add additional history and memory as the cultural district ages and develops.

Chapter 11: Historic Preservation

On HP-244 “No resources reflecting the fifth and final theme of development (1970-present) are currently listed on the City's Register” is incorrect as The Center/Gayzette/Albert Bell Building at 3780 Fifth Avenue is a designated resource.

In conclusion, Chapter 5 LGBTQ+ Cultural and Chapter 11: Historic Preservation should work together for the preservation and designation of LGBTQ+ historic sites. By acknowledging, preserving and incorporating the LGBTQ+ history of Hillcrest past, only then can Hillcrest truly engage with the LGBTQ+ present and future. The San Diego Historic Site Projects looks forward to working with City Planning in its evolution of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Charles S. Kaminski

Charles Kaminski, Historian, Architect, Preservationist
San Diego LGBTQ Historic Sites Project
PO Box 2729
La Jolla, CA 92038
858-956-9141
May 28, 2024

To: Planning Commissioners  
Re: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Historic Preservation Element

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider the following comments and recommendations regarding the Historic Preservation Element of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

**Section 11.3 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES RELATED TO HISTORICAL RESOURCES**

The educational aspects of historic preservation are well-covered by the policies in this section; however, most people experience historic preservation in the everyday use of historic buildings. Rather than viewing development and preservation as antagonistic interests, the Historic Preservation Element and associated policies should emphasize adaptive reuse as a way to harmonize those interests.

Accordingly, we recommend that these additional policies be added on page HP-249 of the May 22, 2024, draft Hillcrest FPA:

- **Proposed additional policy:** HP-3.7 Emphasize adaptive reuse rather than destruction of historic buildings, thereby reducing landfill construction waste and ensuring compatibility with surrounding buildings.

- **Proposed additional policy:** HP-3.8 Collaborate with community planning groups and historic districts to define neighborhood design standards, which will set expectations for both developers and community members and reduce contention over projects.

- **Proposed additional policy:** HP-3.9 Create community centering places around historic resources.

- **Proposed additional policy:** HP-3.10 Enhance pedestrian access and enjoyment of commercial historic districts through better sidewalks, including shade trees.

Historic preservation and adaptive reuse complement each other by allowing further development while maintaining the sense of place that attracts both neighborhood residents and outside visitors, creating socially and economically vibrant communities.

Other benefits of adaptive reuse include:

- Furthers the city’s sustainability goals by reducing landfill waste.
- Promotes mobility goals by creating attractive, human-scale, walkable neighborhood centers.
- Addresses housing needs by preserving existing naturally-occurring affordable housing.
Architecture is our most public art, and unlike art and artifacts sequestered into museums, it is part of our everyday lives that we can touch and inhabit. Cities that have embraced historic preservation have found that they are important drivers of economic activity that justify the tax investments and regulations that are used to maintain them.¹ The fact that so much attention is being given to Hillcrest is proof of people’s preferences for historically-centered places.

Section 11.2 IDENTIFICATION AND PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The policies listed on page HP-247 of the May 22, 2024, draft Hillcrest FPA include:

HP-2.2 Intensively survey and prepare nominations for the potential historic districts identified in the Uptown Historic Resources Survey and bring those nominations before the Historical Resources Board for review and designation. Prioritization of district nominations may occur in consultation with community members and stakeholders based upon a variety of factors, including redevelopment pressures and availability of resources.

HP-2.3 Provide support and guidance to community members and groups who wish to prepare and submit historic district nominations to the City, consistent with adopted Guidelines.

We strongly support these policies; however, as noted in policy HP-2.2, the processing throughput of historic districts is currently limited by Historic Resources staff levels. Policy HP-2.3 addresses this need by fostering a partnership between city staff and community preservationists that will enable Historic Resources staff to process more districts and clear the current backlog. This includes local recognition of districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Regarding the statement that historic preservation be conditioned on “redevelopment pressures” as stated in Policy Hp-2.2, much of the opposition to historic preservation is based on the premise that historic preservation has a significant impact on housing development and affordability. To put this in perspective, San Diego has a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (or RHNA) goal of 108,036 new homes.² The city’s own inventory of existing zoning, called the Adequate Sites Inventory, is 175,000, not including Community Plan Updates since 2020. This means that San Diego has already met the housing capacity goals set by the State of California’s Housing and Community Development department. Further, recently completed and pending Community Plan Updates will add the capacity for hundreds of thousands more units. This does not count programs such as Complete Communities Housing Solutions and Accessory Dwelling Units, which add the capacity for millions more housing units without changing San Diego’s zoning.

Given this massive overcapacity of developable land, the public has a reasonable expectation that future development can and should be done with thoughtful planning, including proper

² City of San Diego, “General Plan Housing Element and Reports,” https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/general-plan/housing-element
consideration for preserving historic resources, which comprise a small percentage of land zoned for housing.

Again, we ask that you consider historic preservation, including adaptive reuse, as an important part of community planning and development. Accordingly, we ask that you further consider the additional policies that we have proposed in support of those goals.

Respectfully,

Geoffrey Hueter
Laura Henson
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 08:07
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-------------
Name:: Alex Wong
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Hello Chair Lee and City Councilmembers, my name is Alex Wong, and I am a member of RideSD. I’m here to express my support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The proposed transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street will significantly enhance bus service, making it faster and more competitive. These improvements will increase transit ridership and provide a better experience for all current riders. I recommend that you approve this plan and implement the transitways at the earliest opportunity. Thank you for your consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41932
Good Morning Council Committee Staffers,

We hope you enjoyed your weekend! RideSD sends this email to share our letters to the Councilmembers of the Land Use and Housing (LU&H) Committee for the meeting this Thursday, June 13th, 2024.

There is one letter for Item-5 (Blueprint SD), another for Item-6 (University City CPU), and another Item-7 (Hillcrest FPA).

Please include these on the public record and share with the Councilmembers.

Thank you so much!

RideSD

www.RideSD.org
RideSD Supports the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment

Honorable Chair Lee and Land Use & Housing Committee Members,

RideSD is San Diego's premier transit education and advocacy organization. Our mission is to promote world-class transit for San Diego through education, community building, and advocacy. Our vision is to transform San Diego's transportation culture and infrastructure to make transit the preferred option to connect communities.

We write to express our strong support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment (FPA) for the Uptown Community Plan.

RideSD is particularly enthusiastic about the proposed transitways on University Avenue and Washington Street. **Dedicated bus right-of-ways will significantly improve commute times, making the bus a more competitive transportation option and increasing ridership.** We also hope that future updates will address the gaps in the Park Boulevard bus lanes and consider implementing bus lanes on 4th and 5th Avenues to better connect Hillcrest to Downtown.

Additionally, the plan addresses San Diego's severe housing shortage by allowing the building of more homes in this urban community. Hillcrest is a vibrant neighborhood known for its inclusive LGBTQ+ community, and we are pleased that the plan will enable more people to become part of this wonderful area.

We would like to thank City staff, especially Claudia Brizuelda and Shannon Corr, for being receptive to the feedback of RideSD and transit riders during the engagement process.

Thank you for your consideration,

Connor Proctor
Vice President
RideSD
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 11:23

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
--------------
Name:: Erick Vieyra
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
--------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a renter in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I have experienced road violence first-hand by reckless drivers that do not care if they hit your bike since there are no dedicated bike lanes. Improving the infrastructure at Hillcrest would make the community truly inclusive and improve the life quality of both residents and visitors.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41963
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 11:42

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: James Fowler  
Email:: [redacted]  
City:: San Diego  
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13  
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment  
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in Mission Hills, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I just moved my parents into the neighborhood here and I was struck by how high rents are. We definitely need more housing!

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41967
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 11:59

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name:: Manny Rodriguez
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
---------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
I support the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Hillcrest is an amazing neighborhood with an inclusive culture that allows people to be themselves and be accepted. I think it is great that more people will be allowed to live there and be part of the community as a result of this amendment.

I am also happy with the dedicated transit lanes proposed in the amendment. I hope that future plans and initiatives can consider expanding them even further.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41973
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 12:58

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Barton Lynch
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
I am a homeowner in district 3. I strongly support the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. We need this to enable smart, environmentally-friendly growth in one of the most culturally vibrant areas of the city.

We must increase overall housing capacity across San Diego in all neighborhoods. This will help to address car dependency as well as high costs. We should prioritize biking within the city - we should be the best biking city in the world with our climate - to meet our climate goals and help to increase safety and quality of life.
I also support the LGBTQ+ cultural district to preserve the heritage of the neighborhood as it grows.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41981
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 13:04

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
--------
Name:: Brandon Comella
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
--------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a renter in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I've seen the need for more housing and transportation options in this area. I've had to move further out of the city to find more affordable housing. I've had much difficulty navigating around the city because the lack of the lack transit options and the fact my family and friends have had to move to further out, less accessible neighborhoods.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41985
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 13:10

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
--------------
Name:: Carl Gehrman
Email:: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
--------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, transit improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I've lived in North Park for many years, and Hillcrest is a frequent destination by bike, transit, and car. I also worked in Hillcrest for several years, primarily commuting by bike and e-scooter, and quickly became very aware of the dangers of University Ave. to anyone outside a car. I'm very encouraged to see the bike lane improvements shown in the plan amendment. It's also essential that transit improvements occur along with higher-density development, and I'm pleased to see provisions for faster buses and eventual streetcar or trolley connections through Hillcrest and over to my side of town.

Parks and other public spaces are also crucial to quality of life, and the amendment includes provisions for those, though I'd of course love to see more. Trees and shared green spaces for the enjoyment of residents and visitors elevate an urban environment from merely hospitable to pleasant and enjoyable, and that element should never be ignored. Implementation will be crucial in this regard.

With 2 large hospitals, a broad array of retail and restaurants, vibrant culture and LGBTQ+ resources, close proximity to the uptown mesa and downtown, and an extensive (though still incomplete) transit and bike lane network, the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment area is an ideal location for high-density housing and living in a car-free or car-light manner.
Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:  
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41988
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 13:39

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: Jonathan Leo
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a rental property owner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way while providing more housing that can help reduce homelessness rates.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive and make the surrounding district more with walkable and safe biking amenities more desirable to live in and can help land values and attract residents.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future because it already has the bones to become of the best, walkable neighborhoods in the US similar to the ones people vacation to in Europe and Asia. Transit improvements and utilizing those corridors to the fullest allow us to create room in the housing market, address a need for smaller homes for household sizes that are 1-2 people and

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at: https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/41995
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 14:19

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

--------
Name:: Anna Crotty
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info

--------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 1, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way. I have two children who will be adults looking for their own housing in the next few years, and unless we build a LOT more housing, they're going to have to leave the region.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for the region's future.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

--Anna Crotty

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42001
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 16:10

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

-----------
Name:: Christopher Margraf
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info

----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a San Diego resident, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I've seen the need for more housing and transportation options in this area for everyone, especially in terms of housing affordability for students and transit accessibility for the elderly and people with movement disabilities. I have seen the struggles of people trying to get places safely, whether it is someone hurrying across a crosswalk or a person trying to bike, these changes are urgently needed. Improving transit and bicycle/wheeled options will allow people to be safer while participating in these activities, incentivizing them to choose those options more, thus reducing reliance on cars and helping to meet our emissions goals.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42027
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 16:49

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-----------
Name: Jay Robinson-Duff
Email: [REDACTED]
City: San Diego
State: CA

Meeting Info
-----------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As an active member of the North Park CPG, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. Without upzoning throughout all of San Diego, Hillcrest will lose its culture. We need to do everything possible to continue having safe spaces for our LGBT neighbors. This plan will help increase the communities ability to support our neighbors who need to live in a welcoming environment. Additionally, having improved mobility between Hillcrest and North Park is vital for the path forward as a city. We need to connect mid city and uptown through a variety of safe and convenient transit options. This plan is helping make the right steps to accomplishing that goal.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42041
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 20:13

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name: Jairo Avalos
City: 
State: California

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego’s housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest’s future.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42070
Submitted on Mon, 06/10/2024 - 18:44

Submitted values are:

Contact Info

Name:: Spencer Hutchins
Email:
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info

Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 3 a, I strongly support the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment and all efforts to build more housing in San Diego.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

I worry that my children will never be afford to live in San Diego as adults if we don't start increasing housing production immediately in this city. My life will also be improved by having more neighbors, more diversity & more vibrant community, cultural and business activity that will come from more people in Hillcrest.

Please approve this amendment, and use it as a first step in bringing more housing, vibrancy & sustainability to the entire Uptown area (and surrounding communities).

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42058
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 08:15

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
--------------
Name:: Gail Laurie Friedt
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: Item 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I have lived in Hillcrest since 2012 and have seen once vibrant sections of both University Ave and 5th Ave turn into a ghost town with abandoned buildings because of lack of housing in the area. By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

As a resident on 1st Ave, I strongly support the one-ways on University Ave and Robinson Ave. Additional traffic calming mechanisms would be welcome on many of the streets in Hillcrest.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42102
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 10:39

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Michael Donovan
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a resident of Hillcrest, I'm writing in support of the Plan Hillcrest amendment to the Uptown Community Plan. I believe that the proposed changes are a good solution to a number of issues we face; lack of affordable housing in the LGBTQ neighborhood, more housing near employment and recreation areas, progress towards safer streets for all with enhanced support for walking, biking and transit. Placing additional density in the core urban business district and mostly leaving the single family neighborhoods alone is a great way to create vibrancy without widespread disruption. The LGBTQ cultural district honors the people and events that made the community what it is today and lowers the focus on buildings that in and of themselves were just convenient. Vibrant Uptown had 2 town halls on Plan Hillcrest with 200 people, mostly in support, attending and providing input to the city - much of which is now included. I urge you to move this plan forward.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42126
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 12:25

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Wesley Morgan
Email:: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7 - Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan

Comments::
I support the Hillcrest Plan Amendment and I’m excited about all aspects of the plan from Housing and Mobility to Cultural Celebration and Public Spaces. I’m a homeowner in Mission Hills, and a daily resident of Hillcrest.

I would like to vouch for the robust community engagement and outreach by the Planning Team to collect community input through a variety of mechanisms.

When the now-outgoing CPG would not listen, the Planning Team made me feel like my input mattered - and it was great to see value-added feedback actually included in each draft of the plan.

After seeing a social media ad in 2020, I participated in the online community survey. And then “The Choose your future Hillcrest platform” in 2022, live and zoom community discussions in 2023, and office hours at the Knox Library in 2024. The interactive mapping, prioritization, and open-ended questions allowed a diverse set of respondents to answer questions and provide input in a way that most represented the feedback they were comfortable providing. When the planning team couldn’t answer a particular question on the spot, they always followed-up with a response.

A Long-Term plan like this requires a wide lens to represent the past, present, and future. The diversity of input, breadth of outreach, and coverage across residents, employees, and visitors all came together to form a foundation for Plan Hillcrest rooted in credibility of primary research.

Thank you and the Planning Department for your efforts and your support.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42150
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 13:15

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Vahan Hartooni
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Hello Chair Whitburn and City Councilmembers, my name is Vahan Hartooni, and
I am a resident of University Heights. I’m here to express my support for
the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. I regularly take the 215 and seen for
myself the benefit of bypassing traffic with a bus lane and the detriment of
having those bus lanes be disconnected. Bus lanes help connect our
communities and that link to Hillcrest is sorely missing. The proposed
transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street will significantly
enhance bus service, making it faster, and more competitive. These
improvements will increase transit ridership and provide a better experience
for all current riders. I recommend that you approve this plan and implement
the transitways at the earliest opportunity. Thank you for your
consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42161
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 12:51

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------------
Name:: Leif Gensert
Email:: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
--------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: #7

Comments::
Hello Chair Lee and City Councilmembers,

my name is Leif Gensert, and I am a member of RideSD.

I’m here to express my support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The proposed transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street will significantly enhance bus service, making it faster and more competitive.

These improvements will increase transit ridership and provide a better experience for all current riders.

I recommend that you approve this plan and implement the transitways at the earliest opportunity.

Thank you for your consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42154
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 12:44

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

Name: Maxwell Gergen
Email: [redacted]
City: San Diego
State: CA

Meeting Info

Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 6 and 7

Comments:
I would like to comment in support of Plan Hillcrest and the University Community Plan Update. We need more housing in areas where people work and these 2 districts are big employment centers. We need denser housing in these areas. And we need better public transit access and more walkable design in these neighborhoods. These 2 community plans have all of that and more. I support both.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42151
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 15:53

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-----------
Name:: Zack Defazio-Farrell
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Dear Committee members,

My name is Zack Defazio-Farrell and I am a renter and a resident of University Heights. I urge you to support the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

Hillcrest is a prime location for more housing. As a Downtown adjacent neighborhood and the core of uptown, it is logical to allow for more housing to be built where many San Diegans frequent on a regular basis. Doing so will allow businesses in Hillcrest to rely on an increased customer base, while also allowing more housing options for current and prospective residents.

Please do not be dissuaded by those who oppose this amendment. All too often, they are resentful complainers that are small in number but large in influence. Their opposition to the amendment is also opposition to more affordable housing, jobs, property rights, and economic opportunity for anyone who didn't buy a home decades ago when housing was affordable. Their vocal opposition threatens to pull the economic ladder up behind them, which seems contrary to the very essence of what makes Hillcrest such a wonderful place.

Please support the amendment.

Thank you

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42192
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 02:44

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Greg Martin
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: Item 7 - Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan

Comments::
I live in the University Heights neighborhood in Council District 3 and strongly support these proposed changes to the Uptown Community Plan. Hillcrest has needed a lot more housing for decades and these changes will allow for that to happen. The proposed transportation changes will allow for easier and safer movement of people in Hillcrest. This too is long overdue. These changes will make it possible for Hillcrest to once again become one of the best neighborhoods in San Diego.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42239
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 23:57

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------------
Name: Sharon Gehl
Email: [redacted]
City: San Diego, CA
State: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
Remove policy HP-2.1 from Uptown Plan
There is a huge mistake on page HP-247 of the Uptown Community Plan Hillcrest
Focused Plan Amendment, March 2024 Draft. Under Policies, HP-2.1 calls for
"interim protection" for potential historic districts. These Interim
protections were voted down by the city council in 2016, because they like
would have created serious legal problems for the city. They should not
still be in the Uptown, (page HP-247), North Park, (page163), and Greater

New historic regulations to “Provide interim protection” were in an
“overly Zone” which were part of the proposed Uptown, North Park, and
Greater Golden Hill Community Plan Updates in 2016. They would have treated
all 26 proposed historic districts in the three communities as if they were
already actual legal historic districts; without first spending millions of
dollars to do the research needed to see if any of the proposed districts met
the legal standards, present them to community groups, and then HRB. This
would have affected thousands of properties.
Fortunately, the city council took the “interim protection” regulations
out of the North Park, Uptown, and Golden Hill Plan Updates eight years ago.
The Planning Department should have taken Policy HP-2.1 out of the three
plans at the same time. Please take it out of the Uptown Community Plan
Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment now.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42237
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 23:48

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: Sharon Gehl
Email::
City:: San Diego, CA
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As the entry on historic preservation in Wikipedia shows, the majority of jobs in US historic preservation are not in Museums, 9%; but in Regulatory Compliance, 70%. In other words, managing the laws and regulations that control officially designated or proposed historic properties. The more properties the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board (HRB) designates, either by force of law or because owners want big Mills Act tax subsidies, the more money professional preservationists in San Diego make. Adding more and more proposed properties to community plans is also a way for professional preservationists to make more money. Appendix E of the Uptown Community Plan lists over 525 Individually and District Designated properties, 17 Potential Historic Districts with some 2678 properties, 4 potential Multi-property Districts with some 953 properties, and 44 Potential Individually Listed properties. If the city already has over 500 designed properties that lower the city’s tax base and the overwhelming majority of people ignore, why do we need another 3,500 to “tell history”? We don’t. This is just about giving professional preservationist control of other peoples property without paying their for it.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42236
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 23:32

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-----------
Name:: Sharon Gehl
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego, CA
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
The LGBTQ+ Cultural District is a better way to tell history
The proposed Plan Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Cultural District would be the most
effective way of supporting the City of San Diego’s Strategies Plan
objective of “Celebrating the cultural diversity and history of the LGBQT+
community”.
The Cultural District will use effective ways of communicating ideas such as
words, written and spoken, pictures and color. It would also include a
walking corridor that would link cultural interpretive elements and
facilitate walking tours, another effective way to communicate ideas.
Identifying and preserving historic resources and districts on the other hand
has proven to not only be ineffective in communicating cultural ideas in San
Diego; it has done damage to the city by preventing much needed new
multifamily housing, lowering property values, and hurting the city’s tax
base.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42235
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 23:29

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

----------
Name:: Sharon Gehl
Email: [redacted]
City:: San Diego, CA
State:: CA

Meeting Info

----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
We need more maps in Historic section
The Historic Preservation section of the Uptown Plan should include maps showing the locations of all of the current Existing and Potential Historic Properties and Districts, including the Multiple Property Listings. The maps in the section show only the Designated and Potential Historic Districts, which gives a false idea of how the proposal to designating some 4,000 properties would affect Uptown’s property values, tax base, and potential for new housing.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42234
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 21:48

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: Kyle Brinker
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: #7

Comments::
Hi SD City Council, my name is Kyle, a resident of Hillcrest and a member of RideSD. The proposed transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street are a great idea! Bus route 10 is our major lifeline to get to Old Town, the most important transit hub in the city, but it's horribly bogged down getting through Hillcrest and Mission Hills. When it's late, I miss my Coaster train to work. Bus lanes already made a huge impact on Park Blvd. We'd love to see them on University and Washington!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42225
Submitted on Tue, 06/11/2024 - 17:55

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: Samuel Meyer
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a renter in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I previously lived in University Heights and wanted to be able to stay in the area, but could not due to limited housing options. If more housing had been available in Hillcrest, I would have been able to stay.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42209
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 11:26

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

Name: Jacob Burrell
Email: [redacted]
City: San Diego
State: California

Meeting Info

Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As a renter in District 8, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. My brother has experienced homelessness, and I know firsthand how critical it is to have sufficient housing options available. Additionally, as someone who values efficient transit options, the improvements proposed in this plan are vital.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42312
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 11:21

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name: Brian Schroeter
Email: 
City: San Diego
State: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As a Hillcrest renter and a voting constituent of District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

Lack of housing affordability is the city and region's #1 problem, whereby its scarcity has knock-on effects that negatively affect poverty, inequality, homelessness, traffic, and the city budget. Simply put, our lack of housing hurts those that cannot afford it the most, creating a situation which saps San Diego of its vibrancy and dynamism and fosters a situation of stasis and sclerosis. By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

Sincerely,
Brian Schroeter
92103

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42310
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 10:52

Submitted values are:

Contact Info
----------
Name:: Brian Warwick
Email:: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a Hillcrest/District 3 resident, I strongly support the Hillcrest Plan Amendment. The proposed changes will make our neighborhood more vibrant, more diverse, and a better place to raise my daughter.

I moved to San Diego from the Bay Area last year--because of that region's failure to build enough housing, there were few affordable options for my family to live in a safe, walkable community. I hope that San Diego can learn from the mistakes of other California cities.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42299
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 12:47

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Sharon Gehl
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego, CA
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
We have dangerous boarded up buildings like the California Theater all over San Diego, that are vacant only because they were designated historic. We should not plan to designating some 3,500 more buildings in Hillcrest when the city knows historic designation of the former Downtown Library has been a financial disaster for the city. Definitely don’t do what SOHO wants and give the preservationists control of entire buildings in the proposed Hillcrest Historic District, not just the fronts that people see. More control might mean more money for preservationist, but it would make it even harder for property owners to do anything with their property, and increase the likelihood that buildings will end up vacant and rotting.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42332
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 13:04

Submitted values are:

Contact Info
-------------
Name: Katrina Oprisko
Email: [REDACTED]
City: San Diego
State: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As a homeowner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally, sustainable, and culturally vibrant way. By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces will make Hillcrest safer to live in.

Living in University Heights, I should be able to bike to Hillcrest safely, my children should be able to afford housing in their hometown. This amendment is essential for future generations to live safely in San Diego.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood for future generations.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42337
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 13:31

Submitted values are:

Contact Info
------------
Name: Sharon Gehl
Email: [redacted]
City: San Diego, CA
State: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
The LGBTQ+ Cultural District will provide noise protections for our LGBTQ+ nightlife safe spaces, expanded hours (including on patios), way finding and decorative elements throughout the district, and protections for legacy businesses.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42343
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 14:34

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name:: Bill Li
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
---------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Hillcrest pays way more property tax per acre than the car-centric suburbs north of I8 that serve as nothing but fiscal time bombs for the city budget, so we should continue the path to fiscal health by encouraging what has been happening in Hillcrest: building more housing, and encouraging active transportation and transit choices. The Hillcrest plan provides a strong basis for this vision and we should pass this plan.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42354
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 14:39

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name:: Keala Rusher
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a resident and employee of District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. More people like me will be able to live in the neighborhood we work in and get around more easily, safely, and sustainably.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42357
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 15:02

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Trevor J Cappa
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. Our housing crisis is deep and wide throughout our city and by not building enough housing, as has been our recent history, we risk destroying the cultural heritage of our most desirable neighborhoods by forcing its residents out due to increasing prices.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42368
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 15:02

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Arthur Pajak
Email: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner in District 3, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. [Add 1-2 sentence personal anecdote]. I am making the effort to lower my personal carbon footprint by selling my car and purchasing an electric bike to run errands nearby. I would like the city to support efforts to make Hillcrest and uptown a safer place for all bicyclists and pedestrians. Our neighborhoods must begin to prioritize people over cars, just like when these neighborhoods were built.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at: 
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42367
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 15:22

Submitted values are:
Contact Info

Name:: Krishna Hammond
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info

Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: Item 7

Comments::
I'm a renter in District 3, and I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing crisis. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive. I love spending time in Hillcrest, but the high price of rent is slowly weakening the district and the entire city. High rents are directly responsible for the continually increasing homelessness crisis as well. I hope that these improvements will make it possible for people who grew up in this city to remain here without crippling rent burdens.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42374
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 15:17

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name: Trevor van Leeuwen
Email:
City: San Diego
State: California

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As a queer renter in Hillcrest, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. We must make space for newcomers to move into Hillcrest so that they, like I have been able to, can feel welcomed and able to be themselves. Acceptance and inclusion is the core of this neighbourhood and I hope others can have the opportunity to live here that I have.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42372
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 15:36

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name: Joseph Tinglof
Email:
City: San Diego
State: CA

Meeting Info
---------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
As a homeowner in District 7, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. More people should be able to live in one of San Diego's most walkable neighborhoods.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42380
Dear Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for increasing housing density and the development of more homes near transit hubs and job centers in University City and Hillcrest.

San Diego is experiencing a significant housing crisis, and addressing this issue requires bold and proactive measures. By focusing on denser housing developments near transit and employment centers, we can make meaningful progress toward solving the homeless, affordability, and climate crisis. This approach will not only provide much-needed housing but also promote sustainable and convenient living options for our residents.

University City and Hillcrest are prime areas for such developments. Both neighborhoods are well-served by public transit and are home to numerous job opportunities. Increasing the housing density in these areas will help reduce traffic congestion, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and support local businesses by providing them with a larger customer base.

University City is near the major biotech hubs in San Diego. We have constant traffic on the freeways because we have zoned ourselves into oblivion and have given people no other option than to commute by car using the freeways into this major job center.

Hillcrest has always been a dense neighborhood and was originally a streetcar suburb. It is designed to be dense and density is what makes it such a great place to live. Also, its close proximity to downtown will allow people to commute by bus and bike to downtown job centers easily, freeing up traffic and giving people an alternative.

Furthermore, denser housing developments can lead to more vibrant and diverse communities. By allowing more people to live near where they work and commute, we can foster a greater sense of community and improve the overall
quality of life for San Diegans.

I urge the City Council to prioritize and expedite plans for denser housing projects in University City and Hillcrest. This is a crucial step towards creating a more equitable, sustainable, and prosperous future for our city.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Clancy Smith

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42388
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 16:53

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Matthew Rodman
Email:: 
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a young homeowner in Hillcrest, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. I believe in a Hillcrest that is a dynamic place of opportunity and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment is an important stepping stone to that goal.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42408
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 16:25

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name:: Joshua
Email: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
---------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a renter in District 8, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, and public spaces will make Hillcrest more livable and connected.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. Having a residence far from hillcrest does not mean its improvement won't affect me or thousands of others that reside in neighboring areas. The increased efficiency of public transit could help decongest key chokepoints on the arteries of the San Diego freeways which would benefit the entire city as well.

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Its would benefit more than just the local area and have compounding benefits in the long term.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42403
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 16:24

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Oscar Leija
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a homeowner and student in District 4, I cannot overstate my support for the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment that will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By adding to San Diego’s scarce housing supply near transit, the amendment addresses our city’s housing shortage while reducing costly car dependency and the resulting heavily subsidized car-centric infrastructure. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. At a time when our state and San Diego specifically is seeing a flight of working class people due to our housing shortage, among that demographic flight are LGBTQ+ youth pushed out by financial pressures to move to cities in states without the same legal protections for their identity. The same LGBTQ+ youth that are overrepresented in housing instability statistics at a time when we are confronting a crisis on our streets of people without housing. To make a difference in our city’s housing shortage for Hillcrest and our LGBTQ+ community, please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42402
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 16:09

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Saad Asad
Email::
City:: SAN DIEGO
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a resident of Mission Hills and near-daily visitor to Hillcrest, the Focused Plan Amendment is a significant opportunity to make Hillcrest more affordable and sustainable.

The best part of the plan is allowing up to 17,200 new homes near transit, which is crucial for addressing our severe housing shortage. Too many of my neighbors are getting displaced by skyrocketing rents. Dense infill housing is the only way to keep Hillcrest diverse and affordable. We need to go further, though, by increasing the number of homes per acre, especially along the core commercial areas. More housing equals lower rents.

I'm glad the plan includes public spaces, wider sidewalks, and bike lanes. I walk multiple times a week along Washington and University streets. I was once nearly run over crossing Washington St, and I have seen elderly folks crossing University St where there is no crosswalk, and it would take much longer to get to the nearest one. These mobility improvements will make Hillcrest more livable, walkable, and vibrant. They're also essential for enabling car-free lifestyles and reducing climate pollution from driving, our #1 source of emissions. However, the plan should be more ambitious by creating more bus-only lanes and pedestrianizing major commercial corridors comprehensively.

Some may argue that new housing will damage the neighborhood's character. However, exclusionary zoning destroys Hillcrest's character by making it unaffordable to all but the rich. We can't maintain community character if LGBTQ residents and legacy businesses are pushed out. Building more homes for all is how we preserve Hillcrest's iconic inclusivity.

The city council committee must pass the Hillcrest Plan, then go bigger and bolder. Allow more housing everywhere. Reform building codes. Build social housing—Reallocate street space from cars to green mobility. Our housing and climate crises demand we pull out all the stops.
The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42396
June 12th, 2024
Honorable Chairperson Kent Lee
City of San Diego
202 C St, 10th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Item 7: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan

SUPPORT

To Honorable Chair Lee and Land Use and Housing Committee Members:

On behalf of the YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County, please accept this letter regarding our support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County are dedicated to growing sustainable housing opportunities in the communities where we live. In addition to developing more affordable and market-rate housing to increase the supply of housing, we believe in prioritizing infill development near transit and employment centers with the goal of increasing our housing supply, leveraging our urban environments, protecting our natural resources and advancing economic inclusion and opportunity for all.

We believe the latest draft supports the objectives of the community and the surrounding area by:

- Increasing housing opportunities near transit
- Creating public spaces to connect people to businesses and services
  - Strengthening mobility connections to make it easier to move around the community
- Celebrating the legacy of the LGBTQ+ community by preserving historical resources and creating new inclusive spaces that celebrate our past while enabling our future
- Supporting local businesses to ensure a thriving and sustainable business district

This Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment further aligns the Uptown Community Plan with San Diego’s housing goals, guiding principles of the Housing Element, and our City’s Climate Action Plan. It affirmatively furthers fair housing by providing opportunities for affordable housing development in the City’s High and Highest
Opportunity Areas associated with positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for families and children. The direct access to these resources provides the community a unique opportunity to develop housing and employment opportunities at scale for working low-income and middle class families.

As advocates for sustainable growth, and new housing, we are grateful for the City’s hard work over the last three years to update the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment and respond to the community’s needs. Overall, The YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County believe that the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment presented today makes reasonable steps towards creating a more equitable, sustainable, and thriving city. We urge the Committee to approve the proposed updates and continue working towards solutions that prioritize housing abundance, affordability, and inclusivity.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County

Note: Some of our board members are employed by the City of San Diego but are participating in this policy advocacy solely in their personal capacity. They are not representing their professional roles in this matter.
Dear Members of the Land Use and Housing Committee,

We are Vibrant Uptown, a group of Uptown residents whose mission is to promote the Uptown neighborhood as a place to live, work, and play for all. We advocate for abundant housing policies, efficient & safe mobility, and public spaces where people and businesses can thrive.

We write to express our strong support for the Hillcrest-Focused Plan Amendment. In particular, we highlight the following benefits of the Amendment to the Hillcrest community and San Diego at large:

1. Creation of an LGBTQ+ Cultural District, recognizing Hillcrest's critical place as a center of LGBTQ+ culture and entertainment in San Diego and supporting both Hillcrest's LGBTQ+ businesses and LGBTQ+ broader community, including by creating a framework for the community to embed Hillcrest's LGBTQ+ culture into the physical landscape and practical protections like noise notices for LGBTQ+ bars and entertainment businesses.

2. Making room for more Hillcrest neighbors, increasing housing capacity where it makes sense, along the main commercial corridors in Hillcrest, near existing transit and in one of San Diego’s most walkable neighborhoods.

3. Improving the multi-model transportation network, enhancing safety and mobility for all community members and improving access to climate-friendly biking and transit options.

4. Requiring developers of certain large projects to provide public spaces through supplemental development regulations, which will provide much needed places for Hillcrest's residents, workers and visitors to enjoy.

5. Contributions to the City's Climate Action Plan goals to reduce VMT by (i) allowing more people to live in an urban environment and close to downtown jobs and improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfortability, thereby encouraging more people to walk or bike (and use transit).

These forward-thinking changes reflect a commitment to creating a more vibrant, inclusive, environmentally sustainable and and safer community, which we fully support.

Vibrant Uptown held two community town halls during the Amendment development process of Plan Hillcrest, in November 2023 and April 2024, with approximately 200 total Uptown residents
attending to learn about the Amendment, discuss and provide their input. Vibrant Uptown forwarded all collected input materials to the Planning Department. Upon reviewing this most recent draft of the plan, we were excited to see many of the comments from those attendees were addressed. It is gratifying to see that the authors are listening to the many voices of the community.

We recommend the Land Use and Housing Committee approve the Hillcrest-Focused Plan Amendment, and we look forward to seeing the positive impact these developments will have on our community.

Sincerely,

Zach Thompson
Member, Vibrant Uptown
Uptown’s CPG Opposes Plan Hillcrest As Proposed

NOW, LET’S TALK ABOUT WHAT UPTOWN’S CPG DOES NOT OPPOSE
WE DO NOT OPPOSE
LGBTQ+ PRIDE

We want to recognize it with a LARGER historic district, as described in our current plan.
WE DO NOT OPPOSE
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
(INCLUDING FOR MEDICAL COMPLEX EMPLOYEES)

We know that market rate high rises will bring gentrification instead.
WE DO NOT OPPOSE SUPPORT FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES

We share their worry that increased traffic congestion, reduced parking, and endless construction projects will harm them.
WE DO NOT OPPOSE
SUPPORTING OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITY

We advocate for parks & recreation facilities and safe streets for all.
WE DO NOT OPPOSE
MEETING CLIMATE GOALS

WE ENCOURAGE

✓ minimizing environmental costs of demolition & concrete construction
✓ preserving naturally occurring affordable housing
✓ adaptive reuse of existing buildings
✓ smart public transportation
✓ protecting open space
WE DO OPPOSE
PLAN HILLCREST AS IS

NOT because of so-called NIMBY-ism
NOR personal property values
NOR hatred of developers
NOR fear of change

BUT because we want a plan that’s good for Hillcrest & all of Uptown!
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 08:50

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
---------
Name:: Sam Mazzeo
Email::
City:: SAN DIEGO
State:: CA

Meeting Info
---------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 8

Comments::
As a Renter in District 2 and a business owner in District 8, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.
By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego’s housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.
This amendment is essential for Hillcrest’s future.
Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let’s create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42486
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 23:39

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-----------
Name:: Alexander Pham
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: La Jolla
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: Item 7

Comments::
As a Renter in District 6, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42465
Submitted on Wed, 06/12/2024 - 19:10

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Alex Graff
Email: [redacted]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Hello Chair Lee and City Councilmembers, my name is Alex Graff, and I am a resident of Hillcrest. I’m writing to express my support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. As a frequent transit and bike commuter in the neighborhood, the proposed transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street will vastly enhance bus service, making it faster and more competitive. Currently for my commute to Torrey Pines, the longest leg of my journey is on the #10 bus between Hillcrest and Washington St Trolley station, which can take upwards of 35 minutes in regular evening traffic. Already each morning, I see dozens of professionals and students take the #10 bus to the Blue Line. Improving transit facilities and adding transitways to Hillcrest will make this route a much more enticing option for everyone who can commute by Trolley, reducing congestion throughout Uptown. I recommend that you approve this plan and implement the transitways at the earliest opportunity. Thank you for your consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42432
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 09:53

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name: Saad
Email: info@yimbydemssd.com
City: La Mesa
State: CA

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: Item 7

Comments:

We need you to submit written comments supporting the University Community Plan Update (CPU) and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment by Wednesday, 5 pm June 12, ahead of the June 13 San Diego City Council Land Use and Housing Committee meeting (agenda here).

Here's how to submit two separate written comments:

Complete this form with your info.
Fill in the following details for the University CPU:
Meeting Date: 6/13/2024
Select Agenda Comment
Enter Item 6
Write your comment or submit the sample below. Mention your City Council district number where you live (Find it here).

Go back to the original form and fill in your info again.
Fill in the following details for the Hillcrest Plan Amendment:
Meeting Date: 6/13/2024
Select Agenda Comment
Enter Item 7
Write your comment or submit the sample below the University CPU comment. Mention your City Council district number where you live (Find it here).

Sample Comment - Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment

As a [renter/homeowner/student] in District [X], I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.

By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego's housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the
LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.

This amendment is essential for Hillcrest's future. [Add 1-2 sentence personal anecdote].

Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let's create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42503
June 13, 2024

Item #7 – Request Adoption of the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Proposed by Uptown United to the Hillcrest/Uptown Community Plan

Land Use & Housing Committee
City of San Diego
(via email)

I urge the committee to Adopt the Amendments proposed by Uptown United to the proposed Hillcrest/Uptown Community Plan.

Uptown United has proposed three amendments to the Hillcrest focused plan amendment of the Hillcrest/Uptown Community Plan. These include:

1. Eliminate the Land Use category of 290 dwelling unit per acre.
2. Public facilities will be provided concurrent with development.
3. Projects with a major impact on the community will trigger a discretionary review that will apply to projects with more than 180 units.

The Peninsula Community Planning Board voted to oppose Blueprint San Diego (Item #5) because it implements a vision for dense development in Point Loma without adequate infrastructure, parking and automobile transit that long time residents did not want because it would destroy the quality of life in
the community. This opposition was based, in part, on the same objections raised by Uptown San Diego.

The amendments are very reasonable and would mitigate some of the adverse impacts contained in the proposed Hillcrest/Uptown plan. I therefore urge their adoption by the Committee.

Regards,

Andrew Hollingworth

Andrew Hollingworth CPA

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42501
Submitted values are:
Sign up for email updates
--------------
First Name: Tanisha-Jean
Last Name: Martin
Email: tanisha@sandiego.edu
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 09:28

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Gina Varela
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
As a renter in District 7, I strongly support the proposed Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. This plan will allow Hillcrest to grow in an environmentally sustainable and culturally vibrant way.
By increasing housing capacity, especially near transit, the amendment addresses San Diego’s housing shortage while reducing car dependency. The emphasis on bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, public spaces, and the LGBTQ+ Cultural District will make Hillcrest more livable, connected, and inclusive.
This amendment is essential for Hillcrest’s future. [Add 1-2 sentence personal anecdote].
Please approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. Let’s create a more vibrant and sustainable neighborhood celebrating Hillcrest’s unique history and culture.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42495
Item-7:
Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment
to the Uptown Community Plan ("Plan Hillcrest")
For three years, we have heard the community’s concerns and relayed them to the City — only to see a mad rush past us these last few months.

What you are voting on today is fundamentally unchanged from what was first conceived over five years ago.

We are here to ask you to do what the Planning Department has repeatedly refused:

We are here to ask you to mitigate a community plan that treats the existing community as expendable, rather than just rubber-stamp what is proposed.
Our Community’s Top Four Concerns

- Mobility
- Density
- Infrastructure
- Gentrification
Mobility

- Turning Robinson and University Avenues into one-way streets, along with dedicating lanes for combined bus lane/emergency use on Washington Street, and reducing vehicle lanes and eliminating parking on all three of Hillcrest’s only east-west through streets, will increase congestion in an already congested area.

- The negative effects of this would extend beyond Hillcrest throughout Uptown and beyond, to impact north-south traffic on Highway 163.

- Neither SANDAG’s public transportation plans nor the City’s required Mobility Technical Report support these radical changes in either a short- or long-term.

- Specifically: the Mobility Technical Report shows our existing high traffic streets and intersections already earn failing grades — yet there are no proposed improvements that are based on fact rather than conjecture.
Density

- The size of the plan area — 400 acres — for which high-density building is expected to compensate for the entire 2,700 acres in Uptown is unconscionable.

- Unprecedented new zoning categories — higher than those Downtown — would lead to buildings over twice the maximum height and density already allowed.

- It calls for over 100% more population in Uptown beyond what exists, our current community plan already provides, and that existing facilities can accommodate — especially public safety and emergency services.

- This instigated growth would far exceed what current SANDAG Preliminary Series population predictions justify, as the City has admitted to relying on outdated versions of their data.
Infrastructure

- Excessive density would be granted “by right,” without any elected representative review or public oversight, nor offsets to its impacts.

- The plan fails to tie private development to infrastructure. We need triggers for corresponding facilities beyond which development cannot proceed.

- This proposal does not adequately protect historic resources, especially those related to LGBTQ+ history, by substituting it with an entertainment overlay zone.

- All of these foreseeable problems will negatively affect the well-being of everyone in Uptown, present and future – especially our most vulnerable.
Gentrification

- This proposal’s reduced mobility, increased density and failure to require sufficient infrastructure would turn Uptown into inappropriately situated Downtown — with all of its downsides and none of its benefits.

- This proposal would not materially address the City’s housing affordability crisis but rather worsen it, due to the incentivized loss of naturally occurring affordable housing and higher rents that will result from instantly increased land values.

- Increased land values would also impact local businesses, as they are pushed to relocate into new, expensive structures over adaptive reuse of existing ones.

- Despite Uptown’s already sizeable population of unhoused and housing insecure, this proposal includes no provisions to subsidize or even encourage substantial development of truly affordable housing or to capture increased land values.
The main stated purpose for Plan Hillcrest is “to affirmatively further fair housing.”

The proposal before you today not only will not but cannot accomplish this.

Do not act in haste to decide our future for a quarter century.
On behalf of the residents and business owners in Uptown, we ask you:

To defer making a recommendation on Plan Hillcrest until a Final Environmental Impact Report is completed — or to oppose it as presented now.
June 13, 2024

Land Use & Housing Committee
City of San Diego
(via email)

Re:  Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment of the Uptown Community Plan

This memo addresses only the Hillcrest plan.

We request that you introduce and support the following changes to the proposed Hillcrest/ Uptown plan:

1. Eliminate the Land Use category of 290 dwelling units per acre.
2. Public facilities will be provided concurrent with development.
3. Projects with a major impact on the community will trigger a discretionary review. This will apply to projects with more than 180 units.

Explanation:

1. There is no need for the ultra-high category of 290 du/acre in Uptown. The current allowable density is 109 du/acre, which has led to many completed and current projects. These include Pernicano’s, Sassan, the two St. Paul’s Cathedral projects and many more.

2. The principle of concurrency is basic to urban planning. Public facilities should be planned to be available at the time development occurs.

3. Implementation provisions are needed which ensure that major projects are subject to public input, via a discretionary review.

Thomas G. Mullaney
Executive Director
Uptown United
UptownUnited3@gmail.com

Hillcrest plan 6-13-24 v2.pdf
There is no need to double the density of the past accepted development plan for Hillcrest. We don't need a second downtown, and there's already gridlock on university and washington at rush hours. This is a gift to Todd Gloria supporters who are developers.

It's irresponsible, not sustainable, environmentally or on a quality of life index! I am not against development projects but do not support the proposed new plan that more than doubles the old plan and irresponsibly eliminates parking, and does not protect historical districts, except LBGT. This does not protect diversity!

Moreover, San Diego is losing population by 40,000 per year. We do not need more housing. We need more affordable housing. If there's any affordable housing in the new plan it would be tokenism, likely subject to bait and switch, where developers move it to somewhere like Santee, post plan sign off.

Jacque Lynn Foltyn
92103
“The consequences of approving Plan Hillcrest for Uptown and all of San Diego will be immediate and devastating.” Image from planhillcrest.org

Friday, November 17, is the deadline for submitting public comment on the Plan Hillcrest draft that will be moved forward to the San Diego Planning Commission.

Launched in 2020, allegedly to address the 11-acre area around the Hillcrest sign that had been carved out of the 2016 Uptown Community Plan, Plan Hillcrest warped into a do-over community plan covering 400 of the 2,700 acres in the Uptown planning area.
Plan Hillcrest is intended to allow development of 19,000 new “units” and buildings of 30 stories and higher to add 50,000 more people — all of it in “one of the more intensely developed neighborhoods in San Diego” and one of the six neighborhoods in Uptown, whose total population is under 60,000.

The city has said that it doesn’t expect this growth to happen immediately, and that the final build-out will probably be much smaller. But the consequences of approving Plan Hillcrest for Uptown and all of San Diego will be immediate and devastating.

The proposed mobility changes, such as turning Robinson Avenue and University Avenue into one-way streets and painting out existing traffic lanes and parking for bike and bus lanes — and the resulting impacts to emergency services, will happen overnight.

Meanwhile, the proposed trolleys and “aerial skyways” that will supposedly offset this crush are decades away and based on speculations of funding from outside agencies.

It would add two completely new zoning designations, CC-3-10 and CC-3-11, with densities of 218 and 290 dwelling units per acre, respectively, to the city’s land development code. (Currently, the highest density zoning in Hillcrest is 109 du/ac.)

These zoning designations would then be available to be used in other planning areas, such as University City and College Area.
The city believes the development will be “incremental,” as it will involve the “redevelopment of existing properties.” But existing land values would skyrocket, instantly incentivizing the demolition of existing affordable housing and increasing rents, turbocharging the cycle of displacement and homelessness.

Despite planning to shoehorn a population higher than the city of Poway into an area smaller than De Anza Cove, there are no plans for more fire stations or libraries or schools, much less a park in a neighborhood that already is the only one in Uptown without a park of any kind.

And rather than implement and protect a proposed Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Historic District, the city is planning to substitute it with an LGBTQ+ Entertainment District organized for the monetization of Hillcrest’s heritage for private profit.

Yet with SANDAG projecting only 40,000 more people in the entire San Diego region in 2060 than there were in 2020, and California continuing to lose population, none of this makes any sense.

Going forward with Plan Hillcrest isn’t just irrational, it’s a dangerous dereliction of duty by our electeds.

It’s time to stop the madness, scratch the current plan, and start over where it should have: the nine-block area around the Hillcrest sign.

Mat Wahlstrom has been a renter in Hillcrest for over 20 years and founded Rescue Hillcrest. He is also on the board of Uptown Planners.
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 10:12

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------------
Name:: Emilio Ingrasci
Email::
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Hello Chair Lee and City Councilmembers, my name is Emilio, and I am a member of RideSD. I’m here to express my support for the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. The proposed transitways for University Avenue and Washington Street will significantly enhance bus service, making it faster and more competitive. These improvements will increase transit ridership and provide a better experience for all current riders. I recommend that you approve this plan and implement the transitways at the earliest opportunity. Thank you for your consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42512
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 10:39

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-----------
Name:: Nicole Verdes
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
Balancing new housing development and preserving our LGBTQ+ culture is important and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment does this by providing for mixed housing with protections for the LGBTQ+ business community. We have to protect the uses that have made Hillcrest what it is. The LGBTQ+ Cultural District does this by protecting our safe spaces and housing options. We need to develop the DMV property in a way that promotes a mix of housing options for a mix of people and the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment does this.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42518
Blueprint SD - Environmental Impact Report
Land Use & Housing

June 13, 2024
Key Environmental Impact Report Issues

Blueprint SD
• Flawed assumptions of Village Climate Goal Propensity Map

University CPU and Hillcrest FPA
• Failure to consider impacts of Complete Communities Housing Solutions
Village Climate Goal Propensity Map
Why is the map so wrong?

The VCGPM is based on wishful thinking re: Transit Buildout

Expected buildout will not make San Diego transit-oriented

- Transit-oriented cities have at least 5 times the population density of San Diego
- Our topography limits access from neighborhoods south of I-8 to high-quality job centers north of I-8

The most “transit-rich” area on the map doesn’t have transit that takes residents directly to high-quality jobs

- Most Mid-City bus lines are a vestige of the 1940s, when San Diego didn’t extend north of Mission Valley and downtown was the only major job center
Why is the map so wrong?

The VCGPM is based on wishful thinking re: Population

Declining Projections

VCGPM based on outdated Series 14 SCS Data:

• **Series 14 SCS** 2050: 1.65M  +269k (+20%) from 2022
• **Series 15 Baseline** 2050: 1.42M  +65k (+4.8%) from 2022
• Projected population growth down by -75%
### Complete Communities Housing Solutions: The invisible hand of community planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Community Plan Update (proposed)</th>
<th>Complete Communities Housing Solutions</th>
<th>CCHS increase over proposed CPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>350% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>277% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capacity for new housing under Complete Communities Housing Solutions dwarfs what is being proposed in community plan updates. Yet we don’t analyze – let alone mitigate – the impacts.
The proposed plan update would take the Sprouts site to 623 units (73 du/acre). Complete Communities Housing Solutions would allow a further increase to 3,189 units, without any analysis or mitigation of the added impacts.
“housing at every price point” excuses underperformance on housing affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Percentage of AMI</th>
<th>6th RHNA Cycle (2021 - 2029)</th>
<th>Progress Reports (2021 - 2023)</th>
<th>% Target (Pro-Rated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
<td>&gt;121</td>
<td>16,401</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>81-120</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>51-80</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>20,121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in previous RHNA cycle, we are:
- Overproducing Above Moderate housing
- Undercounting Moderate Income housing
- Underproducing Lower Income housing
As development pivots to Complete Communities, affordable housing contributions lag behind inclusionary housing requirements.
Recommendations

Village Climate Goal Propensity Map

• Re-run models with realistic, fundable transit buildout targeted to limited high-density areas
• Re-run models with best available (Series 15) population and housing projections

Complete Communities Housing Solutions

• Let community plan updates work as planned
• Suspend CCHS upon adoption of Community Plan Update
Thank you!

Geoffrey Hueter
Chair, Neighbors For A Better San Diego
NFABSD.org
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 11:48

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name: Lawrence Vulis
Email: [redacted]
City: SAN DIEGO
State: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments:
I am a resident of Bankers Hill and am excited for the proposed amendments being made to the uptown community plan. Please continue to add bus lanes, bike lanes, and pedestrianize the neighborhood. Continuing bus lanes along University Ave from North Park will help to ensure quick bus arrival times and make the bus more appealing. With the planned increase in density, the neighborhood and city will NEED to look to create alternative forms of travel that are more efficient and take up lower footprints. Please also continue to consider decreasing headways and advancing the SANDAG streetcar to enable intracity transport.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42537
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 15:11

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
----------
Name:: Agata Bugala
City:: San Diego
State:: California

Meeting Info
----------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: #7

Comments::
I am a renter living in Bankers Hill. I wholly support building out more public transit and bike lanes in the area. I believe having effective modes of getting around enables me to support local businesses and improves our community. The bike lanes on 4th and 5th ave allow me to easily get up to Hillcrest as does the #3 bus. Improving bus lanes so that getting to North Park along University Ave will also enable residents like me to travel without a car. I also am very supportive of improving pedestrian safety along 6th Ave, the specific intersections of Fourth Ave and Juniper, Sixth Ave and Juniper and Grape Streets, and the other specific streets mentioned. Recent accidents by erratic drivers such as the crash in Balboa Park have made me nervous to walk in the neighborhood, and I look forward to be able to walk safely again. Also, I am against building luxury housing because it is unaffordable and prices out current residents of Bankers Hill. For example, Fourth and Laurel was recently built and has prices of $6k for a 2 bedroom. It has remained mostly empty and no one moves in, displacing residents. The City should take over the building and lower the rents.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42575
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 13:35

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
------------
Name:: Patric Stillman
Email:: [REDACTED]
City:: San Diego
State:: CA

Meeting Info
------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: ITEM-7: Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan

Comments::
I urge the Committee to support the Hillcrest amendment. As a business owner in Hillcrest, I believe that both LGBTQ+ Cultural District and Plan Hillcrest are great benefits to keep the quality of life in Hillcrest and protect the needs of our neighborhood for future development. Thank you for supporting years of community engagement to make these plans a reality.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42556
Submitted on Thu, 06/13/2024 - 11:48

Submitted values are:
Contact Info
-------------
Name:: Lawrence Vulis
Email::
City:: SAN DIEGO
State:: CA

Meeting Info
-------------
Meeting Date:: 2024-06-13
Comment Type: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment
Agenda Item Number: 7

Comments::
I am a resident of Bankers Hill and am excited for the proposed amendments being made to the uptown community plan. Please continue to add bus lanes, bike lanes, and pedestrianize the neighborhood. Continuing bus lanes along University Ave from North Park will help to ensure quick bus arrival times and make the bus more appealing. With the planned increase in density, the neighborhood and city will NEED to look to create alternative forms of travel that are more efficient and take up lower footprints. Please also continue to consider decreasing headways and advancing the SANDAG streetcar to enable intracity transport.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.sandiego.gov/admin/structure/webform/manage/webform_1032443/submission/42537