

College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB)

Minutes from the Regular Meetings: January 12, 2022 at 7:00 pm

Held At Faith Presbyterian Church, 5075 Campanile D. & via Zoom Conference Call

P	Jim Jennings	President	p	Robert Higdon
P	Tom Silva	Vice President	P	Jean Hoeger
P	Ann Cottrell	Secretary	P(A3)	Chris Luna
P(A2)	David Cook	Treasurer	P	Robert Montana
P	Rachel Gregg	SDSU Appointee	P(A4)	Ja'Mar Montgomery
P	Shawki Moore	SDSU AS Appointee	P	Troy Murphree
P(A1)	Jim Schneider	BID Representative	P(A2)	B.J. Nystrom
P	Ellen Bevier		A (??)	Jerry Pollock
A(A5)	Andrew Gade		A(A3)	Eva Yakutis
P	Jean Hoeger			

TOTAL BOARD MEMBERS: 20 (momentarily 18)

P= present L= Late A – Absent (1),(2),(3) = 1st, 2nd 3rd absence

CP 600-24, Art. IV, Sec 1: “A vacancy exists upon the 3rd consecutive absence or 4th absence in 12 months (April May)

M/S/C = Moved/Seconded/Carried

The College Area Community Council (CACC) and the College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB) are two separate entities with a common board and officers and joint meetings. The items highlighted below with asterisks are CACPB business items, subject to City Council Policy 600-24 governing community planning groups. Items are reported in agenda outline order, although some items may have been considered in a different sequence.

COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEETING

I. Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda

A. Move to approve agenda: Nystrom S:Silva

Y:16 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

III. Minutes of November 10, 2021

Move to approve minutes: Nystrom, S: Jennings

Y:16 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

IV. Public Comments on non-agenda items within CACC Jurisdiction:

A. *Murphree*: I'm concerned that I didn't see anyone from CACPB-CACC at LU&H Committee or Planning Commission hearings about ADUs. Is no one concerned that profiteers are buying up land for big ADU developments at above asking price so little is available for families? We need to advocate for at least returning to state laws.

Jennings: ADUs don't come before planning groups & we're not told when they will be discussed at city level.

Hoeger: It's hard for working people to have a say. They meet in the day & have eliminated the ability to cede one's time to a speaker.

Jennings: It's hard to know how to attend. City announced hearing on Planning Groups but gave no zoom link.

V. Law enforcement, elected officials, business district, SDSU

A. *Hintzman, Friends of College Rolando Library*: We continue to try to find out the intent of the adjacent property's owner. Last Spring he was very visible but has been silent for the last 6 months. The city knows nothing about him. Is he interested in selling? We should think creatively about possible alternative uses for the land that would be more compatible with library.

Montgomery: Maybe he realizes it is dumb to pursue zone upgrade when plan is being updated. We need to pay attention to the plan update & assert our voices; we need the whole community.

Murphree: Can we put library parking specifically into the new College Area plan?

B. *Peterson: SDSUPD*

1. Move in is next week but students aren't required to return until classes resume in person.

2. We're hosting March Madness this year. We're working with athletics & NCAA to assure a good traffic plan. *Jennings*. Are you working with SDPD for maximum enforcement around campus?

Peterson: We can look into that; right now we're working on the traffic plan.

Hoeger: In the past on concert & Aztec game nights traffic control people were at neighborhood entrances. They're gone now, when & why did it end. *Peterson*: That was part of Dollar per ticket agreement. I'll check with traffic/parking office for information.

C. *Nguyen: CD 9*

1. We're using responses to community budget priorities survey for our budget recommendations.

2. A *Nextdoor* post complained about city not responding to reports of homeless encampments & referenced both Eastern & Mid-city SDPD. I spoke with those CROs about the process for reports on Get It Done (GID). These reports go to Housing Commission & are routed to PATH which makes contact. After 48 hours if they can't handle the situation it is referred to the SDPD HOT (homeless outreach team), & if they can't resolve it SDPD is brought in. It's not true PD is not involved but PATH is the first to respond.

3. *Cottrell*: In November you spoke about regular meetings with the College Area. What are these & how do we hear about them?

Nguyen: We did have November meeting with SDPD, SDSU & some community members. Elo-Rivera wants to have more regular meetings with College Area but none are presently scheduled.

D. *Moana???, Assembly member Weber's Office*:

1. Reported on bills introduced & schedule, including 4 community conversations in different areas. See website for details on activities.

E. *Schneider, College Area Business District*:

1. We have been focused on attracting new businesses & development on our commercial corridors. Introduced new businesses in College Area.

2. Howard Johnson Motel on El Cajon Blvd has sold for a mixed use development of low & moderate income housing, not student housing.

G. *Gregg, SDSU*:

1. ARC Membership: Membership costs are being adjusted as all students now pay for ARC in student fee. CACC members are community members; CACC needs to update membership lists regularly for members to get special rate at ARC. CVEA members are affiliate members.

H. *Moore, SDSU AS*:

1. ARC membership information is on hold for the moment.

VI. New Business

A. *New CACC: Montana*

1. New revised bylaws have been sent to board.

Move to accept revised bylaws: Silva S: Montana

Jenkins: The Coalition has already approved them so it only needs this board's approval to be in effect. The Coalition board must then implement action to schedule the first annual meeting in February, when the new CACC board will be elected.

Roll Call vote:

Y:16 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

2. Creating the New College Area Community Council

Jenkins: When we have a date for the first meeting election announcements can be sent out.

It should be simple, an email of interest in an at-large board position to the Coalition president.

Montana: I suggest Thursday, Feb. 24. We need a volunteer to spearhead implementation with weekly blasts to all current CACC & Coalition members.

Jenkins: bylaws specify that election procedures be written. Higdon & Bevier volunteer.

3. *Elections for new CACC Board*

Move CACC elections Feb. 24: Silva S: Jennings

*Carried by consensus

VII. Treasurer's report: *Cook*

Expenses: \$171- post office box, \$26- Fat Cow annual fee. Donations: \$50. Balance: \$23,845.

VIII. Committee Reports: none

IX. Delegate reports

A. *CARPUS: Hoeger* There was no meeting

X Adjournment: 7:20 p.m.

COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD MEETING

I. Call to Order/ Agenda approval: 7:21 p.m.

Jennings: Need to add approval of Toyon House in Alvarado Estates.

Move approve amended agenda: Montana S: Nystrom

*Carried by consensus

II. Approve Minutes of November 10, 2021

Move to approve minutes: Silva S: Nystrom

*Carried by consensus

III. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items in Jurisdiction of CACPB: None

IV. New Business

A. *Proposed new single-family residence, Toyon Rd, Alvarado Estates: Jennings*

This was approved by planning committee & then by planning commission.

Move to approve: Jennings S: Silva

*Carried by consensus

B. *Announcements of CACPB elections: Jennings*

This election will be in March. If interested go online to find forms. 14 seats are open; those with most votes will get 3 year seats, those with least will get 2 year seats.

V. Committee reports:

A. *Community Plan Update: Montana* We didn't meet.

VI. Delegate Reports

A. *CPC: Silva*

1. Proposed changes to Planning Groups'(PG) status

- City Attorney says PGs are inconsistent with City Charter thus illegal & should be eliminated. In November revisions to policy 600-24 (governing PGs) were proposed in response to a 2018 move to eliminate them or severely limit their involvement in planning process.
2. La Cava (Councilmember & former CPC chair) has proposed revisions to 600-24 to make PGs consistent with city charter. (Charter change requires charter amendment approved by voters.)
 - a. PG boards must be more representative, reflecting findings of required demographic survey with mandatory membership categories, e.g. renters, home owners, business owners.
 - b. Yearly “COW” training required & certified for all board members.
 - c. City will not support PGs: no website location for PGs, no email announcements of PG meetings, no meeting space, no planning department representative.
 - d. PGs would need to pay for their own bank accounts.
 - e. Because PGs will be advisory, not elected or city staff, city will no longer indemnify board members (indemnity is reason for training requirement).
 - f. PGs can’t appeal planning decision; they will have to pay \$1,000/appeal just as any individual.
 - g. Conditions of service; those running for board must provide personal & financial information which will be available to public. Term will be limited with a 2 year mandatory break at end of term (elected officials only need 1 year break).
 3. What now?
 - a. This goes to Planning Commission Jan. 20; if approved as expected the proposed revision goes to City Council.
 - b. CPC wants individual PGs to study La Cava proposal (none have seen it) & make recommendations.
 - c. PGs must decide by September what they can live with & what are deal breakers. If the city approves revisions we’ll be recognized as PGs with no authority, no support, no indemnity.

VII. Adjournment: 8:50

* Carried by consensus

Minutes by Ann Cottrell, Secretary