

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego
9485 Aero Drive • San Diego, CA 92123
SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov • (619) 235-5200

CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Philomena Marino, Barrio Logan (BL)	Brian Gile, Navajo (NAV)
Mary Young Chollas Valley/Encanto (CVE)	Steve Oechel, North Park (NP)
Tom Silva, College Area (CA)	Andrea Schlageter, Ocean Beach (OB)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)	Mark Freed, Otay Mesa
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Eric Law, Peninsula (PEN)
David Moty, Ken-Tal (KT)	Korla Equinta, Peninsula (RB)
Harry Bubbins, La Jolla (LJ)	Wally Wulfreck, Scripps-Miramar Ranch (SMR)
Howard Wayne, Linda Vista (LV)	Guy Preusse, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
Dike Anyiwo, Midway-Pac. Hwy (MPH)	Chris Nielsen, University (UN)
Chris Cate, Mira Mesa (MM)	Stu Gross, Uptown (UP)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)	

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: None. The following groups currently have single absences: BL, MM, NP and RPQ.
Double absences: DNTM, RB, and SPH
Triple absences: CMR, CV, DMM, KM, MPH, NH, OT, OMN, PB, CMR/SS, SP/LH, SY, SE, TS, TP and TH.

City Staff/Representatives: Marlon Pangilinan, Planning Department.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. CALL TO ORDER/MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA:

Chair Andrea Schlageter called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. and roll call was conducted.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Non-Agenda public comment included the availability of a template from a member of the Uptown Planner that can be used to create new operating procedures for planning groups' application for recognition, the sharing of an article regarding cannabis dispensaries and that any new groups selected for recognition undergo elections within 60 days of being recognized.

BOARD COMMENT:

Comments provided by the CPC members included a concern about unelected individuals of a new group being recognized as the planning group for a community

and that all applicants selected for recognition be subject to an election in December as part of the process. It was also mentioned that the Planning Commission should be thanked for not supporting SB 10 at this time.

3. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 27, 2023 MINUTES:

Approval of the June 27, 2023 minutes as revised to include Eric Law representing the College Area and Ken Calloway representing Mission Valley:

Yea: CA, EA, CVE, KT, LJ, LV, MPH, MM, NAV, NP, OS, OM, PEN, SMR, SPH and UN.

Nay: None.

Abstain: BL, DT, MV, RB and UP

Minutes approved as revised: 16-5-0

4. PLANNING GROUP STIPEND - (INFORMATION ITEM): Marlon Pangilinan, Interim Program Coordinator with the City Planning Department is evaluating the stipend that planning groups receive every fiscal year on a reimbursement basis and asked the CPC about what materials, services and costs they would need to support planning group operations and to build awareness of planning group in local communities.

The following comments, concerns and ideas were provided and expressed by the CPC members and the public in attendance:

- The \$500 stipend doesn't go far, so groups are limited to only certain features with email distribution apps and webpage design.
- There should be an equal, uniform and standardized process for websites especially with some communities consisting of multiple neighborhoods.
- Webpage start-up costs are an expensive up-front cost. It would be beneficial for a one-time website start-up stipend.
- Templates for websites would be helpful.
- The \$500 stipend isn't enough to cover mailing costs.
- The "Meeting Owl" by Owl Labs is an option that helps run hybrid meetings and could cost approximately \$2,000 and be paired with the \$200 projector.
- The City should consider joint use of the stipend between communities.
- Checking account fees should be factored into the cost as well.
- It was mentioned that some people don't use websites and that yard signs could be a way for noticing meetings and events.
- The City should consider a unified, citywide for planning group elections to increase visibility of planning groups.
- It was mentioned that planning groups in Los Angeles are allocated \$30,000 in funding.
- Information booths at parades or at community events – going where the

public would be a good way to expand awareness of planning groups and issues.

- Funding should also be considered for application fees and fees for filing appeals.

5. BLUEPRINT SAN DIEGO AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES – (DISCUSSION ITEM):

The following comments and concerns were provided and expressed by the CPC Ad-hoc Committee which included Chris Nielsen, David Moty, Eric Law and Tom Silva, as well as members of the public in attendance:

Comments and issues from the Ad-hoc Committee members as well members of the public in attendance included:

- Planning groups are "significant" when referring to "diverse stakeholders" because relative to CPUs they have been constant/consistent with their involvement whereas planners change or are reassigned, and other interest groups aren't as engaged/committed.
- The exemption to the Community Plan Amendment (CPA) Initiation process does not allow planning group review/recommendation or PC's approval.
- The Propensity Map needs to be explained/clarified.
- The way parks, open space, and private open space is considered is conflated. They are different things altogether.
- Bike lands should come under a "uniform standard."
- Issues were expressed with the use of the word "contiguous" relative to sidewalks and that a "Sidewalk Master Plan" should be created.
- It was commented that SANDAG's data is inaccurate, villages aren't located everywhere. It seems that they are only in "rich" areas based on factors and therefore are not equitable because villages are targeted for improvement, investment and infrastructure.
- It was expressed that planning issues revolve around "climate" which tends to frame policy and choices in a limited manner.
- Comments were also shared from members of the public that the Region Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the mandated housing capacity that results from that process is fiction as it is based on bloated information from SANDAG especially since overall population is decreasing.
- The focus should also be on providing low-income housing not on "missing middle" income housing.

The Ad-Hoc Committee mentioned that they will continue to meet on Sept. 18 and share additional information at the at the next CPC meeting in September.

6. REPORTS TO THE CPC

Chair's Report:

- Subsequent meetings will be held at the Cathy Hopper Clairemont Friendship Center at 6:15 p.m.
- Although SB10 is not moving forward, there are still other things in HAP 2.0 that are still an issue like developers being able to build their required affordable homes offsite or pay in-lieu fees. HAP 2.0 still has to go to the Land Use & Housing Committee (LU&H) and to the City Council.
- At the next meeting, Uptown will present a draft letter for the CPC to consider supporting regarding the City Planning Department overstepping their authority over planning groups, especially given that the City wants to treat groups as independent entities.
- OB Pier Design meeting – Preferred designs will be presented on Sept. 9 at Liberty Station at 2:00 p.m.

Staff Report – None.

CPC Member Comments:

- Although the Planning Commission voted not to send SB 10 forward, they only voted to study it, so we need to keep the pressure on.
- It was shared that the book *Pride of Place*, which was published in the 1990's pointed out both good points and flaws about development in the City and provided an understanding of how towns grew, and which ones were compatible with human scale.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Tuesday, Sept. 26, 2023.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Schlageter at 7:46 P.M.