

Community Planners Committee

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

APPROVED MINUTES FOR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Philomena Marino, Barrio Logan (BL)
Eric Edelman, Carmel Mt. Ranch/
Sabre Springs (CMR/SS)
Barry Schultz, Carmel Valley (CV)
Russ Connelly, City Heights (CH)
Nicholas Reed, Clairemont (CLMT)
Tom Silva, College Area (CA)
Bob Link, Downtown, (DNTN)
Marry Young, Chollas Valley, (CVE)
Kathy Vandenheuvel, Golden Hill (GH)
David Moty, Ken-Tal (KT)
Diane Kane, La Jolla (LJ)
Howard Wayne, Linda Vista, (LV)
Dike Anyiwo, Midway-Pac.Hwy (MPH)
Bill Crooks, Miramar Ranch. N. (MRN)
Jeff Stevens, Mira Mesa (MM)

Deborah Watkins, Mission Beach (MB)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)
Brian Giles, Navajo (NAV)
Jim Baross, Normal Heights (NH)
Steve Oechel, North Park (NP)
Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)
Mark Freed, Otay Mesa (OM)
Scott Chipman, Pacific Beach (PB)
Korla Eaquinta, Peninsula (PEN)
Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos (RP)
Victoria Labruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Catharine Stempel, Serra Mesa (SM)
Brad Remy, Torrey Pines (TP)
Chris Neilsen, University (UN)
Mat Wahlstrom, Uptown (UT)

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: None. The following groups currently have two (2) consecutive absences this calendar year: BMR, DMM, KM, EA, FR, OT, OMN, RE, and SP/LH, SY, SPH, SE, TS, THLS, and THLNDS.

The following group have single non-consecutive absences: BL, GH, CMR/SS and TP.

City Staff/Representatives: Marlon Pangilinan, Planning Department.

1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS:

Chair Andrea Schlageter called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and conducted roll call.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Terri-Ann Skelly – Suggested that the Planning Department not bundle Municipal Code changes in a way that makes it difficult to understand and how it will affect changes. Changes are supposed to be only to simply and streamline the permitting process; assure compliance with State and Federal regulations; and eliminate unnecessary barriers, redundancies, and contradictions. Diane Kane – Concerned to

about the ability to use Zoom and similar type meetings for Community Planning Group (CPG) and upset at legislators who have done nothing. There is a new statewide Senate Bill that has been entered into legislature by Senator Portantino of Los Angeles that will allow community groups to use Zoom in perpetuity and be in compliance with the Brown Act. CPC should champion this legislation. Becky Rapp – Article in the paper mentioned that City was granted almost \$900,000 for marijuana entrepreneurship equity. City plans to increase the number of marijuana storefronts by 3. The voices of the Youth Council in City Heights should be considered when it comes to understanding how money can be better used in San Diego. Matt Wahlstrom – Requested that CPG members receive Accela training if possible. Scott Chipman – Expressed issue with equity relative to selling marijuana and that Proposition 64 has been a huge failure. The industry is failing and being subsidized, and the tax revenues have not materialized. Kathleen Lippitt – Commented on the alcohol issues in her community and expressed a desire for the CPC to revisit the alcohol CPU process. Jim Baross – Discussed the use of OWL technology that will allow for the simultaneous hybrid and in-person meetings and invited members to attend his CPG meeting on March 7 to observe how the technology is used.

3. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2023 MINUTES:

It was mentioned by N. Reed, Vice-Chair that Brad Remy from TP was present at the January meeting and the correct spelling for member Bob Semenson from MB was provided. Motion to approve the February 28, 2023 meeting minutes as amended by CM, seconded by UT:

Ayes: BL, CMR/SS, CV, CVE, CH, CM, CA, DT, KT, LJ, LV, MPH, MM, MRN, MV, NAV, OB, OM, PB, PEN, RB, RP, SR, SM, UN, and UT. Nays: 0. Abstain: GH, MB, NH, and NP.
Minutes approved: 26-0-4.

4. UPDATE ON REQUIRED BYLAWS CHANGES - (INFORMATION ITEM): Marlon Pangilinan, Interim Program Coordinator, Planning Department provided an update on the Community Planning Group (CPG) process for City Council recognition under the amended Council Policy 600-24.

Board Comment:

CPC members commented the following:

- It is not ethical for the City to tell CPGs that they need to put these documents together and make it arbitrary if they are doing a good job or not.
- CPG members are all volunteers and that this process is unfair. There needs to be boxes that can be checked and very specific guidelines. It should be clear about the City expects.

- The necessary documents up on the website and that that the Participation and Representation Plan seems nebulous for a document that the group will be spending the most time on.
- The process needs to emphasize clarity and that templates should be provided as soon as possible.
- Council Policy 600-24 Administrative Guidelines which provided good direction.
- During CPG elections it is evident that that are other groups that are running against us.
- How competition to represent the community would drive more inclusivity and a need to work together.
- The application process takes a “cookie cutter” approach and that it can’t work for all communities.
- The whole CPG recognition process was questioned because it really has nothing to do with planning, but about an exercise in democracy and whether the City will really pay attention to CPGs.
- Ability to fill seats that are open and unassigned as opposed to assigned seats, which would likely sit vacant and whether there would be any notification regarding other competing groups applying for recognition in the same community and whether portions of the application could be uploaded separately since bylaws may take a while to put together.
- A request was made for the City to provide assistance and resources regarding how a group would evaluate diversity so that the same standard is used.
- Renters aren’t invested in the long-time consequences in a community.
- That next month the discussion should continue to provide more time to review and provide points of clarity.

CPC members expressed the following concerns with regard to:

- Competing groups, whereby existing groups have made an effort to represent the community and a new, competing group just shows up.
- Other subgroups being only interested in one area of the community and that existing boundaries should be remain intact and not split up into area.
- Geographic boundaries being open in this application process (e.g. a Homeowner’s Association applying to represent a certain portion of a community).
- What protections or guidelines are there against new, non-elected groups being able to replace duly elected groups? New groups have not been tested like existing groups

- Other “wealthier” groups with their own fees could have an unfair advantage over volunteer organizations who may not have funding.
- The process having the potential to invite outside interests with influence since City Council will be considering what group will be representing the community.
- Special interest groups (e.g. realtors or developers) that are not based in the community could end up representing our communities. representatives would be and allow for lobbyists.
- Concerns about what happens if only one groups applies and the City doesn't like them.
- Other groups supporting issues that the community has been opposed to (e.g. SDSU students vs. the community).

5. QUESTIONS REGARDING AB 2449 - (INFORMATION ITEM): Marlon Pangilinan, Interim Program Coordinator, Planning Departments discussed the ability to hold meetings under AB 2449 which would allow CPG members to attend virtually without disclosing members' teleconference locations subject to conditions associated with “just cause” reasons or in the event of an emergency.

Board Comment:

- Regarding physical meeting locations, it was commented on that although the Civic Center Downtown was centrally located that it was not an ideal location after hours.
- It was offered that Alcott Elementary School in Clairemont could possibly be a good option since it has hosted CPG meetings previously, as well as Alice Birney Elementary in Uptown.
- It was mentioned that people traveling out of time should be able to attend virtually.
- Other comments expressed that hybrid meetings are not required but if a CPG chose to hold a hybrid meeting providing a remote ability for the public to participate in CPG meetings in real time could be difficult to conduct.
- It was commented on that the Council Committee Room in City Hall does not have consistent seating arrangements and accommodations for all the CPC members.
- A request was made for everyone to contact their State representative to act on SB411.

6. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STREET PRESERVATION ORDINANCE -

(INFORMATION ITEM): Chelsea Klaseus, Deputy Director, Transportation Department presented on proposed changes to the Municipal Code related to Street Preservation Ordinance, stipulating requirements on excavators, restoration relative to utility trenches in City streets, and other refinements to the ordinance. Deputy Director Klaseus mentioned that the amendment would include how concrete alleys and streets would be addressed as well and that the amendment would address all municipal excavators (public and private).

Board Comment:

- It was expressed that the restoration of roadways in general is needed due the recent, continuous rainfall that has occurred.
- It was expressed that a policy needs to be included to address delays in street work.
- Comments also expressed concerns about potholing in streets, the patchwork of asphalt and concrete

7. LAND USE AND HOUSING COMMITTEE (LU&H) PRIORITIES - (DISCUSSION ITEM):

Chair Schlageter requested that CPC members email her regarding potential priorities for future agenda items, so that they can review land use items that fall in line with LU&H Committee priorities and what the City Council will be looking at.

8. REPORTS TO CPC:

- **Staff Report** – None.
- **Chair's Report:** Chair Schlageter requested that CPC members please contact their State representatives to support SB 4. Chair also mentioned drafting language summarizing concerns expressed on the CPG recognition application process.
- **Vice Chair's Report:** Vice-Chair Reed mentioned that he would be running for Vice-Chair re-appointment. Vice-Chair also informed the CPC members to not tolerate poor behavior directed at CPG members and that members should not hesitate to contact City staff or other CPG members.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Tuesday, March 28, 2023:

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Andrea Schlageter at 8:10 PM.