



Downtown Community Planning Council San Diego

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

PRE-DESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING OF THE DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLANNING COUNCIL

TUESDAY APRIL 9, 2019
5:15 PM

CIVIC SAN DIEGO
401 B STREET, SUITE 400
SAN DIEGO, CA

1. Roll Call at 5:15pm. DCPC Members in Attendance: Nancy Wilson Ramon, Rand Barbano, Cindy Blair, Dan Wery, Jon Baker, Pat Stark, Paul Pensabene & Claudia Escala. Non DCPC members Gordon Summer (Cortez Hill Resident) & LC Cline (Downtown Residents Group)
2. Public comments on non-agenda items. Thursday City Council Economic Development Committee will be looking at Stockdale's proposal to reduce required retail space from 600K to 300K. Gary Smith will be making a request for the Lyceum theatre not to count as part of that.
3. Report from Chairperson: Claudia Escala announced this is her last meeting as DCPC member and is looking for a volunteer to chair this subcommittee. She is available to share all the subcommittee related information.
4. **Action item**
 - First & Beech Amendment (south side of Beech Street between First and Second avenues) – Centre City Development Permit/Planned Development Permit (CCDP/PDP) No. 2015-49AA – Revised Design Review – Cortez Neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area ~ William Chopyk

The proposed project is presented as an amendment and consists of a 39 story, approximately 425 ft. tall residential development consisting of 429 dwelling units and 454 automobile parking spaces in three below grade levels and five above grade levels. The applicant proposes 15 very-low income off-site affordable units at 1060 C Street a property also owned by the applicant.

Presentation by Architect- AVRP

The Project has been presented a few times and continues to develop. It follows the same overall approach with a more organic side facing the water on the west and a more formal city side facing the east. The current design presents the idea simplified and stylized to make it more visually appealing. Also the floor plates are better stacked all the way up. The base has not changed as the team was pleased with it before. There has been an increase in units and slight height change.

DCPC Members & Non Member Questions

Q. Share more information on sail material. **A.** It is a façade treatment. The sail is created with framing and slightly different complementing glass colors. Some of the space contained in the sail is interior space and some is balcony space. **Q.** Noticeably missing is the view of the south. View where the liquor store is. Should be provided in next round. **A.** The idea for the blank wall is a two toned fluted concrete. Light colored concrete and standard colored. **Q.** On the parking façade facing 1st street with alternating types of glass how will that screen headlights at night? **A.** The predominant glass is actually opaque. **Q.** Doesn't translucent glass allow for light transmission? **A.** Behind the glass is a 42" solid barrier wall. **Q.** Is fluting on blank wall everywhere? **A.** No the fluting is just horizontal. **Q.**



Has the applicant addressed the Exterior Building Maintenance (EBM) system? **A.** There will be structure to support the EBM system but has not been fully developed yet. **Q.** Where will all davit arms be stored? **A.** The intent is to maximize open space which will include collapsible davit arms. **Q.** Where is the storage for davits? **A.** Have not gotten that far yet. **Q.** Planters on façade how are they going to be maintained with a scissor lift will it be on site or rented? **A.** Originally wanted to use faux planting. **Q.** The redesign proposes a simplification of the rooftop. Should add to package views as one approaches the building from the freeway. What is the driver of the change and do you see it as an enhancement? **A.** Yes the design team sees all changes proposed as an enhancement to the previously approved design. **Q.** Nothing has changed with the sun angle? **A.** Correct. **Q.** Increase in unit count is that a result of smaller units? **A.** Yes. **Q.** Explain the 15 off site affordable units. **A.** The applicant is pursuing 5% very low income off site affordable units. The calculation is based on the base maximum. Additional units above base maximum do not have to be used in the calculation. Per Civic SD any other units have to pay the inclusionary fee. **Q.** What is state requiring in terms of affordability? **A.** City ordinance requires paying a fee or providing the affordable housing units. **Q.** What does off site affordable housing mean? **A.** Once the applicant determines the number of affordable housing units to be provided they are permitted by right to be build off site in the same community planning area. There is a commitment to build them in a certain period of time. **Q.** Are there specific plans for the 15 units. **A.** They are planning to locate them in the other project they are presenting tonight. **Q.** The previous building had 4 elevators current scheme has 3. Can you explain? **A.** There is a high probability the applicant will be reconsidering that the 4th elevator.

Public Comments

Gary Smith – President Downtown Residents Group - Neutral: His board found the building attractive last time. Above grade parking is still an issue. Renderings are better looking. Outside planters are an issue. Has experience with his own building where planters tend to fail either due to waterproofing or drainage issues. May use some artificial greenery. At ground level how do units with additional doors in the passage way work. On the north side at the end of the passage there is space named amenities that does not look easily accessible. Given the comments does like the one driveway versus two. When there are two driveways the hump between it is not convenient and does not work in practice. Need rendering of south wall and how building looks from far.

DCPC Member Comments:

Jon Baker: The tower is a big improvement over last time. Renderings suggest there is a difference in plane but the reality is they are in the same plane. The angle in the taper of the sails is varying only slightly so it looks a little bit awkward. Regarding the planter comments he agrees with concerns and maintenance issue. Scissor lift for maintaining the planters does not seem something feasible. Not sure they add much to the overall design. Davits not sure how the davits could get over a full story. Ground plane is well handled.

Pat Stark: Generally agrees with Jon Baker. Rooftop will be a functional problem as each equipment will need its own equipment. Simplified roof top may not look as good from far away. More study needed. Tower as a whole works.

Claudia Escala: Recommends applicant to look at the Semptra & 655 Broadway projects for EBM systems at tall glazed building tops. A catwalk will most likely be required to go over the proposed tall glass walls. The tower is more sophisticated than before and welcomes the new design.

- 1060 C Street (northwest corner of 11th Avenue and C Street) – Centre City Development Permit/Planned Development Permit (CCDP/PDP) No. 2019-02 – Preliminary Design Review – East Village Neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area ~ William Chopyk

The Project is comprised of a 9-story, 85- foot tall mixed-use building comprised of 72 dwelling units, and 1,150 SF of ground floor commercial space, with 9 ground floor parking spaces and 66 additional parking spaces off site.



Design Issues and Considerations:

- Overall Massing and Neighborhood Fit - Does the Project's overall massing, storefront canopy and fenestration pattern present a development compatible with existing development and the fenestration pattern of the adjacent YWCA building consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines?
- Ground Floor Proportions – Does the proposed canopy design detract from the overall storefront appearance and reduce its apparent ground floor height?
- Ground Floor Materials – Should the upgraded white stone tile material be extended to the second level above the garage door on the east elevation for a more consistent ground floor storefront appearance?

Presentation by Architect Callison/RTKL

Building sits at corner of 10th & 11th. On the opposite corner is the historic YMCA building. An extra separation of 3'-0" is included to not block any windows. The project is adjacent to SRO homes. The lobby is located at the corner of 11th & C Streets. Due to the metrics of the site the depth of the commercial space had to be slightly sacrificed. Off 11th Ave. there is one curb cut. No below grade parking. 9 convenient spaces. Remaining spaces will be found in developers other conveniently located projects within 500'. The project's design places glass elements and bay windows on strategic locations. The ground level plane is 18' in height. The architecture takes cues from the YWCA building and brings some datum lines across through the canopy element. The proposed project intends to be a nice neighbor to the historic building similar in color but more in a more modern way. As building transitions on 11th Ave. the canopy takes on the 3'-0" transition. A mezzanine that adds 4 units to the project alters the height of the ground floor. The materials are white stone at base of building and off white stucco above with the intent of complementing the YWCA building. The top is intended to create a green experience with a green trellis structure to grow vegetation and screen the mechanical equipment. The night view has no architectural lighting except for some canopy lighting.

DCPC Members & Non Member Questions

Q. Is corner glass a butt joint or is there a mullion at the corner? **A.** Would like to do a seamless glass corner but is still studying. **Q.** Does adjacent element go in front of window? **A.** No. **Q.** Some mullions missing? **A.** Yes. **Q.** Window with multiple panels what is that? **A.** Roll up garage wall for the transformer vault. **Q.** Could trash room be further towards front? **A.** The project is trying to get as many parking spaces as possible. The trash chute now stacks. Parking is most likely only for employees. **Q.** 5'-0" gap between project and SRO may create an alley way. How to control the gap? **A.** At ground plane it is a zero lot line condition with the neighbors fence. A floor up is setback 5'. **Q.** With new parking rules how does that work with unbundled parking?. Will the complementary parking from adjacent building work? **A.** Per Civic SD the project is under the old rules but they can switch. With new rules not requiring any parking it becomes more of a management issue. Parking provided does have to be unbundled. **Q.** Affordable housing? **A.** Some of these units will help the other project. An agreement with the SDHC will need to be in place and conditioned for 55 years. **Q.** How do you envision move-ins with reduced clearance? **A.** The thought is to get small vans for move ins. Per Civic SD there is a unique situation with C Street which will have bike lanes and no parking on C Street. No curb side parking will be available. **Q.** Balconies on the C Street side are overhanging the sidewalk. Given the wood construction how will they be drained back? 1'-0" for depth of balcony does not look sufficient. **A.** Will look carefully at loading and balcony construction. **Q.** With very low income are there any need for services? **A.** No because it is not permanent supportive housing.

Public Comments

Julie Hamilton – Represents the owner of the adjacent properties at 1130 and 1134 11th Ave. A formal letter was submitted addressed to the Chair person. First clarification is that the properties do not function as SROs. They are apartments composed of studios and 1 bedrooms. Between this project and the 11th & B there will be 85' high shear walls on each side of her client's properties. Issues with loading can be anticipated. With the trolley and a proposed bike lane on C Street, plus the project not providing enough vertical clearance at Level 1 to allow for a moving truck and increased reliance on internet shopping delivery vehicles will not have a place to park. The reduced storage space is not enough to store a bike. The size is inadequate and needs rework. Curious about how many units are for low income residents. Biggest issue is shadowing and massing immediately adjacent to the



property. The building will be in shadow for most of the day for 6 months. It will turn into a pocket of no light and little air. Would like to ask applicant to consider both the 1130 and 1134 11th Ave. properties and revisit the issues described above.

Gary Smith – President Downtown Residents Group - Neutral: Insufficient storage means things end up in balconies. Retail space needs access to the garage currently not shown. Not sure why the developer did not buy the two low rise adjacent properties. This project fits well adjacent to the YWCA. Need to figure out loading and unloading in the building even if parking is sacrificed. The building is OK as designed. The commercial space makes sense.

DCPC Member Comments:

Rand Barbano: Curious about how the two existing buildings have handled move ins, etc. Julie Hamilton noted that they have been using the existing parking lots. 25 units currently exist. At the moment the units don't have storage. Rand also inquired if there had been any discussions regarding buying the adjacent properties. Per Julie H. there have been discussions with the developer but did not make any progress towards any agreements and they have asked for confidentiality.

Paul Pensabene: Inquired if there had been any further discussion with the owner of the adjacent properties and the answer was no.

LC Cline: Asked if there was any proposed bicycle storage and applicant noted it is provided in the half floor. Believes it is problematic to move bicycles in the elevator. The actual design of the development has good lines and sees the reason behind how the windows are set. Also provides very nice adequate outdoor space.

Jon Baker: From a design standpoint the building is fine. Sees issues with deliveries. From an urban planning point of view we are creating a land lock scenario with a canyon like condition. Worried about making the decision to move forward with this project.

Pat Stark: Concur with comments previously mentioned. From a design perspective the building looks OK but is not sure it will turn out as drawn based on experience as a contractor. The applicant needs to come back with a delivery loading plan because right now it is not feasible or practical.

Claudia Escala: At first in looking at the package did not get the building but after listening to the architect present the project understands the intent of the proposed building being a good neighbor to the YWCA. Recommends the architect consult with a dry utility consultant in regards to the proposed transformer room roll up gate right on property line as SDG&E has very specific guidelines for on grade transformers.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:20pm