

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 MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, SEPT. 24, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Matthew Wang, Clairemont Mesa (CM)	Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)
Andrea Hetheru, Chollas Valley (CV)	Jimmy Ayala, Otay Mesa (OM)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Marcella Bothwell, Pacific Beach (PB)
Brian Schwab, Golden Hill (GH)	Korla Eaquinta, Peninsula (PEN)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)	Becky Rapp, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Christopher Beesley, Linda Vista (LV)	Bill Crooks, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Bo Gibbons, Mira Mesa (MM)	Cat Stempel, Sierra Mesa (SM)
Brian Gile, Navajo (NAV)	Chris Shamoon, Tierrasanta (TS)
Paul Coogan, Normal Heights (NH)	Liz Shopes, Torrey Pines (TP)
Lynn Elliot, North Park (NP)	Chris Nielsen, University (UNIV)
	Mike Singleton, Uptown (UP)

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:

The following planning group have single absences: CH, MV, OM, UP and NH.

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, CV, DMM, GGH, KM, MB, MPH, MM, OTSD, OMN, PB, SPLH, SY, SE, TP,TS and TH.

AGENDA ITEMS:

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

Chair Schlageter called the meeting to order at 6:17 p.m. upon reaching quorum and roll call was conducted.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT.

Non-agenda public comment included:

- Toxicity issues related to a manufacturing use in City Heights.
- Notice of Preparation for a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for park improvements in Mission Bay Park.
- Opposition to locating a homeless facility in the Middletown neighborhood of Uptown.

Comment from the CPC Members included various comments on:

- Opposition to Assembly Bill 1775 regarding allowing cannabis cafes.
- For the City Attorney's Office to look into better lease terms for the City relative to 101 Ash Street and supporting homeless facilities.
- Concerns expressed about the proposal for a housing project on an adjacent library lot instead of youth center.
- Having a continuing discussion on planning group stipends on a future agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 23, 2024.

Motion: Approve of the July 23, 2024 minutes. Motion by NP. Second by EA

Yea: EA, KT, NAV, NP, OB, PN, SR and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: CV, CLMT, LV, MM, NH OM, PB, RB, SM, TS, TP and UP.

Minutes approved: 8-0-12

4. MEASURE B (INFORMATION ITEM).

Jon Schmid, consultant for Measure B presented City's public process to evaluate its trash and recycling services. The study will review, options for new or enhanced services, costs for the options, a fee structure to address costs and accommodations for low-income residents.

Comments from the public and the CPC included the following:

- The need to define and clarify terms regarding homeowners and multifamily as it relates to the proposed measure.
- Concerns that that this could be an additional tax, but later it was clarified that this would be a user fee since a service is derived.
- Questions were raised regarding who is ultimately paying for discounted programs and how Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), junior ADUs and future SB9 lot splits would be calculated.
- A need to outline all fees involved.
- The City has been picking up the cost for trash services, this cost would likely increase per household.

5. REQUEST FOR LETTER OF SUPPORT REGARDING CONTRADICTION CODE (ACTION ITEM).

Andrea Hetheru (CV) and Robert Campbell from the Chollas Valley Community Planning group presented on a request for CPC to support a letter of concern regarding San Diego Municipal Code that retroactively undermines the basic thrust or significant elements of Community Plans. The specific item of concern is Chapter 13, Footnotes for Table 131-0D (7).

Comments from the public and CPC included the following:

- Overall, the CPC members expressed general support and sympathy towards the planning group's request.
- That the presenters made their case. It was suggested that the letter could have bulleted points and show how things would change from RS-1-2 to RS 1-7 so readers would have an idea regarding the effect of the change.
- The planning group should not be pressured or required to provide a presentation for an appeal. When they get their time, they can choose to provide one or not. It's their time.
- They should find out whether this was a part of a Land Development Code Update that got slipped into the Code. When specific code language involved Centre City, they received a whole presentation. Chollas Valley should have received one to explaining the footnote.
- It is suspected that the issue in Chollas Valley is tied to a project in the Southeastern community since the footnote addressed that community as well and that this would not happen in a more affluent neighborhood.
- Condensing and simplifying the letter would be helpful.
- Consider how Sustainable Development Areas (SDAs) would apply to the project site, because they may already be allowed to have higher density they are proposing.
- That it's likely we'll all be experiencing this situation with future plan updates.
- Need to articulate and clarify more on how the situation is attributable to racial bias when the applicant building on a large lot and providing some affordable housing.
- A good point to include is that areas with low income have less open space and that the property owner/applicant knew that with a plan update they could have an opportunity to densify. With updates to community plans, the City will have an opportunity force high density on the community where they might not want it.
- This is an example of how communities are getting disenfranchised – certain projects are being approved without our review, removing virtual public comment and now we have to pay for \$1000 appeal fees. Some groups are raising their own funds.
- More research should be done to identify if the project was using density bonus or SDA, cross reference who owns the property and if there are any lobbying connections and if it was a code update or amendment, and a call for park space for support for the letter, and possibly going to the press.
- Maybe also indicate that the issues raised in this situation run contrary to the City's Equity Forward program.

Motion: To APPROVE support of the letter authorizing the Chair with assistance from the Vice-Chair and Secretary to modify the letter to convey the general sentiments expressed by CPC.

Motion by KT. Second by NH.

Yea: CV, CLMNT, EA, KT, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PB, PN, RB, SR, SM, UNIV and UP.
TS was in support, but will not be able to register a vote until after two (2) consecutive meeting attendances.

Nay: None.

Abstain: OM

Motion approved: 17-0-1

6. CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT WORK PROGRAM OVERVIEW (INFORMATON ITEM)

Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator with the City Planning Department will present a brief overview of the initiatives and ongoing work items that the City Planning Department is working on for fiscal year 2025.

Comments from the public and CPC included the following:

- Presentation is beautiful and the work is appreciated, but the City Planning Department should be aware of “mission creep” and in light of the issues brought up civic process, to remember the focus is on servicing the communities.

7. REPORTS TO CPC

- **Chair Report:** None.
- **City Staff Report:** Marlon Pangilinan from the City Planning Department provide several short updates regarding the items from the department’s work program. CPC members were encouraged to reach out to staff regarding any additional details on any initiatives of interest.
- **CPC Member Comments:** Paul Coogan shared his thought after reviewing the last Development Impact Fee (DIF) report mentioning that there are lots of funds left in lock boxes and that the communities are entitled to use it and that it should not be wasted away on administrative fees are use frivolously.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

Meeting was adjourned at 8:20 P.M. to next regular meeting on Oct. 22, 2024.