Community Planners Committee

City Planning Department ● City of San Diego 202 C Street, M.S. 413 ● San Diego, CA 92101 SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov ● (619) 235-5200

APPROVED CPC MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sally Smull, Chollas Valley-Encanto (CVE)
Marcellus Anderson, City Heights (CH)
Nick Reed, Clairemont Mesa (CM)
Tom Silva, College Area (CA)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)
Harry Bubbins, La Jolla (LJ)
Felicity Senoski, Linda Vista (LV)
Bill Crooks, Miramar Ranch North (MRN)
Brian Giles Navajo (NAV)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)

Paul Coogan, Normal Heights (NH)
Lynn Elliot, North Park (NP)
Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)
Mark Freed, Otay Mesa (OM)
Korla Equinta, Peninsula (PEN)
Representative, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Jon Becker, Rancho Peñasquitos (RPQ)
Catharine Stemple, Serra Mesa (SM)
Victoria LaBruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
Representative, Torrey Pines
Chris Nielsen, University (UNIV)

VOTING INELIGBILITY/RECUSALS:

The following planning group have single absences: CV, MB and UP.

The following planning groups have double absences: BL, CMR/SS, DMM, GGH, KM, MPH, MM, OTSD, OMN, PB, SPLH, SY, SE, TS and TH.

AGENDA ITEMS:

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA:

Chair called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m. upon reaching quorum and roll call was conducted.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Non-agenda public comment included:

- A representative from Power San Diego requesting that the recent study from SDG&E regarding municipalization of utilities be disregarded since it was not signed.
- Comments about how voting for representatives in government can change the laws that affect how the City processes administrative approvals.

• Recognizing the Clairemont Town Council who donated flat panel screen in the Friendship Center for community meeting use.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 27, 2024 and ROLL CALL:

Approval of the February 27, 2024 minutes as revised for the LDC Amendment item: to reflect CH as an abstention and that the vote on the item passed by majority vote according to the CPC Bylaws. Motion by NP to approve minutes as revised and seconded by CLMT.

Yea: CVE, CH, CLMT, CA, EA, KT, LJ, LV, MRN, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PN, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: DT, MV, OM and SM

Minutes approved as revised: 19-0-4

4. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT (ACTION ITEM)

Sameera Rao, Assistant Deputy Director and Paola Boylan, Senior Planner from the City Planning Department presented the Draft Environmental Justice Element seeking a recommendation from the CPC.

The following public comments were provided regarding the Draft Environmental Justice Element:

- Interest expressed regarding the availability of data points that informs priorities.
- There is broad support for EJ concepts, but reservations on how it influences prioritization of resources and funding. EJ goals and plans should be supported in concept, but there is a danger in it guiding community plan updates.
- Theoretically the ideas are good but how are these ideas implemented like with addressing market forces that affect food deserts.
- In light of the City's inattention to Chollas Creek, the City should also focus on fire improvements and fire risk given that the past wildfires caused more destruction than the Chollas Creek floods.
- Sustainable Development Areas (SDAs) created a huge overlap with Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) and areas of low-income. We should stop using Transit as a way to concentrate affordable housing.

The following comments were expressed by CPC members regarding the Draft Environmental Justice Element:

 Prioritizing parks in Otay Mesa should be considered under EJ since it has been underserved and overlooked for infrastructure and underserved, despite all the recent village type development.

CPC Draft Meeting Minutes March 26, 2024

- The EJ Element has a good set of goals.
- EJ polices are important given the number of families put out by the flooding along Chollas Creek.
- Normal Heights has been struggling to find land to replace a community garden despite having the will of the people and some private funding.
 Interest was expressed in being able to fast track a project once a property is identified and to encourage private property acquisition.
- A concern was raised that nothing about EJ has been mentioned in the newspaper, on KPBS or the radio. There hasn't been enough information received to make a recommendation.
- It was expressed that the EJ study has been very focused on only a small
 portion of the City, done in partnership with just a few groups and that the
 study excluded so much of the City that should be EJ needs areas.
 Additionally, it was suggested that EJ should consider SANDAG's Zero Litter
 program for cleanliness and health.
- Although it was mentioned that the EJ Element is great overall policy, it was
 expressed that lacks input from other communities which should have been
 part of the EJ effort back in 2021 not ignored and could've had the potential
 to refined with other issues like fire risk. It was suggested that there needs
 to be an effort to come to other groups, listen and include everyone.
- Questions were raised regarding the factors and datapoints that informed the EJ Element. It was expressed that there is a disconnect between prioritizing infrastructure where greatest needs exist when Council Policy 800-14 identifies need as only 25% of the consideration.
- Questions were also raised regarding the datapoints used to inform the EJ Element given that Grantville has not had a single park, new infrastructure or school built, despite the number of units built.
- It was mentioned that not enough supermarkets are located within City's communities and that with regard to public space opportunities, church properties should be looked into.
- It was also expressed that Clairemont was not properly represented on the EJ Maps since the community has have low-income neighborhoods and therefore the datapoints need to be revisited again. Additionally, it was commented that Clairemont also has high fire risk areas given the canyons.
- It was also suggested that all brands of electric vehicles should be provided for when it comes to electric vehicle charging especially at City facilities.

Chair Schlageter asked for any motions and mentioned that the CPC has a meeting the day before the EJ Element goes before the Planning Commission. No motions were offered to provide a recommendation and the item was tabled to a future meeting.

5. UPDATE ON CHANGES TO COUNCIL POLICY 600-24 AND CPG RECOGNITION (INFORMATION ITEM)

Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator with the City Planning Department presented on the proposed amendments to Council Policy 600-24, which were brought before the Land Use & Housing Committee and will be presented to the City Council. The proposed amendments include:

- Allowing any newly formed planning group that meets all the requirements of Council Policy 600-24 and agrees to the Terms and Conditions to be eligible for recognition by the City Council contingent upon completing an initial election within 90 days.
- Establishing an independent election committee that will utilize the election procedures of the newly formed planning group as guidance for conducting the initial election and consist of appointed members affiliated with the community per Council Policy, none of which are candidates in the initial election.
- Allowing the existing planning group to continue as the interim planning group until such time as the elections for the newly formed planning group are completed.
- Allowing voting members of planning group members to attend virtual meetings without posting their teleconference locations on the meeting agenda and agendas at their teleconference location.
- Providing a defined timeframe for when planning groups will submit their annual reports to the City – Within 14 days after the approval of the March meeting minutes.
- Describing the process for the City to approve amendments to planning group operating procedures.

Comments from the public included the following:

- 14 days doesn't allow enough time for the group to complete and submit their annual report.
- Clarification needed regarding voting restriction in council policy.
- The City Attorney's Office should look at whether planning groups could be characterized as legislative bodies given their relationship with the Brown Act and the proposed amendment regarding allow virtual meetings.
- Clarification on whether all members of the newly-formed group have to run for election.
- Virtual meetings are convenient, but in-person are also good so there should be a balance.

Discussion and comments from the members of the CPC included the following:

• Virtual meetings could occur every other month and that it was good to see virtual meetings are coming back.

CPC Draft Meeting Minutes March 26, 2024

- Planning groups should encourage in-person meetings, but allow virtual meeting capability.
- Clarification on how household members' ability to vote in elections should be forwarded to the planning groups and well as well as procedures for conducting virtual meetings should be provided to the planning groups.
- There should not be a limit to having virtual meetings. Virtual meetings have resulted in large turnout at meetings due to convenience, especially for those involved with their kids' activities. There is potential for loosing members without virtual meetings.
- In-person meetings provide opportunities for interaction and getting to know others.
- Virtual meetings also made it convenient for government representatives to attend meetings.
- A "technical advisory committee" should be created to address overall technical issues associated with virtual meetings.
- Having hybrid meetings should be a minimum and that there should be one physical address for someone to attend the meeting.
- Planning groups and their subcommittees should be able to make their own decisions on whether to use hybrid or in-person meetings.
- "Virtual" has no place beyond City Hall but only in academic discussions. We learn so much from body language in in-person meetings.
- Use of virtual meeting technology like the "owl" have been effective in holding virtual meetings.
- Overall thanks were expressed towards City Planning staff for assisting planning groups with the recognition process.

Motion by DT to change this item from an Information Item to an Action Item. Seconded by CA:

Yea: CVE, CH, CM, CA, DT, EA, KT, LV, MRN, MB, NAV, NH, NP, OB, OM, PEN, RB, RPQ, SR, SM, SPH, TP, UNIV

Nay: None Abstain: None.

Motion was approved: 23-0-0.

Motion by CA to approve amendments to Council Policy 600-24 and allow annual reports to be submitted within 45 days of the approval of the March meeting minutes. Seconded by CLMT:

Yea: CVE, CH, CM, CA, DT, EA, LV, MRN, MB, NAV, NH, NP, OB, OM, PEN, RB, RPQ, SR, SM, SPH, TP, UNIV

Nay: KT

Abstain: None.

Motion was approved: 22-1-0.

6. ANNUAL REPORT PORTAL (INFORMATION ITEM)

Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator with the City Planning Department presented on the release of the Online Annual Report Portal which will allow planning groups to submit their annual reports online. The portal will collect basic information on planning group members, officers, and subcommittee members as well as details on special projects and efforts planning groups have worked on. The portal also allows planning groups the option of uploading their approved minutes to document their work through the past year.

Comments from the CPC included the following:

- A "save your work feature" would be preferred and allow groups to complete their reports if they needed continue their work at another time.
- Whether board rosters could be included as an attachment.
- Clarification of when the annual report would be do.
- Whether minutes from the planning group subcommittee could be included.

7. BLUEPRINT SAN DIEGO (DISCUSSION ITEM)

Chair Schlageter reported that City Planning staff will be presenting the recent draft of Blueprint San Diego at CPC next month as an action item and welcomed the subcommittee or any members of the CPC to bring any recommendations for consideration next month.

8. REPORTS TO CPC:

- City Staff Report: None.
- **Chair Report:** Chair Schlageter reported that the preferred design alternative on the Ocean Beach Pier will be presented on Saturday, April 6 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. at Point Loma Nazarene University Conference Center in Liberty Station.
- CPC Member Comments: Vice-Chair Nick Reed mentioned that he will be leaving his role on the CPC and on the Clairemont Community Planning Group, the Linda Vista Community Planning Group was recognized for their thorough work in providing input on public engagement related to the Inclusive Public Engagement Guide and La Jolla thanked everyone for their support during the planning group recognition process as they move forward.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

Meeting was adjourned at 8:27 P.M. to next regular meeting on April 23, 2024.