

# Community Planners Committee

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

## APPROVED MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2024

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Heden, Carmel Valley (CV)	Emilie Colwell, Normal Heights (NH)
Andrea Hetheru, Chollas Valley-Encanto (CVE)	Lynn Elliot, North Park (NP)
Marcellus Anderson, City Heights (CH)	Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)
Matthew Wang, Clairemont Mesa (CM)	Mark Freed, Otay Mesa (OM)
Tom Silva, College Area (CA)	Eric Law, Peninsula (PEN)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)	Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Steve Leffler, Rancho Peñasquitos (RP)
Brian Schwab, Golden Hill (GH)	Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)	Victoria Labruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Felicity Senoski, Linda Vista (LV)	Matt Wahlstrom, Uptown (UP)
Brian Gile, Navajo (NAV)	

### VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:

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

Per Article IV, Section 5 and Section 6 of the CPC Bylaws the following planning groups have three (3) consecutive absences and will not be able to vote until recordation of attendance at two (2) consecutive CPC meetings by a designated representative or alternate:  
BL, CMR/SS, DMM, GGH, KM, MB, MPH, MM, OTSD, OMN, PB, SPLH, SY, SE, TS and TH.

### AGENDA ITEMS:

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA

Chair Schlageter called the meeting to order at 6:43 p.m. upon reaching quorum and roll call was conducted.

#### 2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Non-agenda public comment included:

- Several projects which received approval through the existing ministerial review process resulted in members of the public expressing concern over whether ministerial review sufficiently takes community voices into consideration. Members of the CPC also commented that the existing ministerial review process does not sufficiently take community review into account and is something that should be further addressed in a later session.

- Clarification on rules involving planning groups being able to host meetings in-person or virtually was provided by City Staff following a question from members in attendance.

- 

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and ROLL CALL

Approval of the May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024 minutes as revised:

Yea: CMR, CV, CVE, CH, CM, CA, DT, EA, GH, KT, LV, NAV, NH, NP, OB, OM, RB, RP, SPH, SR, UP

Nay: None.

Abstain: PEN

Minutes approved as revised: 21-0-1

**LOSS OF QUORUM:** Chair Schlageter announced a loss of quorum at 7:54 p.m. due to the departure of the CV representative. As a result, subsequent agenda items are information items or reports to the CPC, with no further actions being taken by the CPC.

### 4. INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIZATION

Sameera Rao, Assistant Deputy Director from the City Planning Department presented on this year's CIP survey and the Infrastructure Prioritization process. Information was provided on the upcoming Five-Year Capital Infrastructure Planning (CIP) Outlook set to release in the City's 2026 fiscal year (FY2026). The FY2026 Outlook will draw from five-year infrastructure plans written by City departments which actively manage City infrastructure.

The City Planning Department announced that they are gathering public input to support the upcoming CIP Outlook. Community members can access an online survey to provide input on which kinds of infrastructure projects the public would like to see developed. This survey will be available until August 1, 2024 for members of the public who wish to provide input on FY2026's Outlook.

In addition to the public survey, the City Planning Department is reaching out to see what kinds of projects planning groups would like to see implemented in their communities. The City Planning Department is accepting direct input from the planning groups until August 15, 2024 for the FY2026 Outlook. A form has been provided for planning group to list and categorize their projects.

Questions and remarks from the CPC included the following:

- CPC members wanted to see in greater detail how exactly the City prioritizes projects, and the rubric associated with this prioritization.
- Identifying the kinds of funding sources that a project could receive was also something that CPC members wanted to know more about.

- For purposes of transparency, members of the CPC wanted to see what scores a project received should it fail to be prioritized.
- The kinds of projects which receive prioritization should be balanced—the criteria used to prioritize projects should ensure that projects are balanced and fairly distributed across San Diego’s communities.

Remarks from the public included the following:

- The County and State levels of government also provide additional funding sources. These levels, and their interaction with City funds, may be worth looking into as another avenue to fund community projects.

## **5. CPG REIMBURSEMENT FUNDS**

Chair Schlageter reminded CPC members about submitting reimbursement requests related to planning group expenses.

CPC members commented on the sufficiency of the existing reimbursement quantity given increased meeting requirements under recent modifications to Council Policy 600-24, as well as the general increase in expenses related to planning group operations.

## **6. SHORT TERM VACATION RENTAL ORDINANCE**

Kevin Hastings presented findings and proposals from a citizen-led initiative on the effects of and potential amendments to the City’s Short Term Rental Ordinance (STRO). The initiative found certain practices involving the licensing requirements under the STRO and impacts on housing in local communities. Some practices brought up included misuse of licensing policies, low enforcement, and a shift in housing stock to cater to short-term rentals.

A letter was formed based upon these findings, which also included a proposal to amend the existing STRO. The CPC was informed of the citizen’s initiative and planned request for review from the CPC. As quorum ended prior to this item’s allotted time, no action was taken on whether the CPC would look further into this matter and instead would be considered at a later CPC meeting.

Comments from the public and the CPC included the following:

- The existing proposal seems to be delving into two issues: licensing misuse and a lack of enforcement. To keep the direction of this topic cohesive, it may worth handling each topic separately, rather than bundle them into a single letter.
- Greater understanding on data transparency practices between the City and short-term rental platforms was considered an element worth adding to future discussions of this topic.

- CPC members expressed interest in gauging whether the Coastal Commission would be willing to enforce the STRO in coastal communities.

## **7. ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS LDC UPDATE REQUEST**

Chair Schlageter reminded CPC members that comments for the Land Development Code (LDC) Update would be open for one more month. The CPC had created a subcommittee earlier to investigate the changes to the LDC since the year 2000 on Process 5 for Capital Improvement Projects.

An action item is being planned for a future CPC meeting regarding this topic.

## **8. REPORTS TO CPC**

- **City Staff Report:** City staff reminded CPC members on the deadline for reimbursement request submissions, which is June 15. Requests falling past this deadline could be reimbursed through stipend allocated for the 2025 fiscal year.
- **Chair Report:** None.
- **CPC Member Comments:** CPC members provided comments regarding reimbursement requests and considered discussing a potential reimbursement increase at a future CPC session.

### **ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:28 P.M. to next regular meeting on July 23, 2024.