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 NOVEMBER 2, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Russ Connelly, City Heights (CH)
Jose Reynoso, College Area (COL)
Kathy Vandenheuvel, Golden Hill
(GH)Deborah Sharpe, Ken/Tal (KT)
Diane Kane, La Jolla (LJ)
Howard Wayne, Linda Vista, (LV)
Lorayne Burley, Miramar Rnch. N (MRN)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)

Jim Baross, Normal Heights (NH)
Mark Freed, Otay Mesa, (OM)
Karl Rand, Pacific Beach (PB)
Margaret Virissimo, Peninsula (PEN)
Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Randy Steffler, Rancho Penasquitos (RP)
Wally Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Eduardo Savigliano, Torrey Pines (TP)
Chris Nielsen, University (UN)
Clint Daniels, Uptown (UT)

<u>VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:</u> Barrio Logan, Del Mar Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Navajo, OtayMesa Nestor, San Ysidro, Torrey Hills, Uptown

<u>Guests:</u> Liz Shopes, Tom Mullaney, Tom Silva, Sandra Wetzel-Smith Debra Knight, SusanBaldwin.

City Staff/Representatives: Tony Kempton, Heidi Vonblum, Brian Schoenfisch, Jonathan Avila

NOTE: The sign-in sheets provided at the entrance to the meeting are used to list CPC Representatives, quest speakers, and staff present at the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS:

Chair Wally Wulfeck called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm. Roll Call: CH, COL, GH,KT, LJ, LV, MRN, MV, NH, OM, PB, PEN, RB, RP, SR, TP, UN, UT.

- 2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: None
- **3. MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.** Approved without modification.
- 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF Not applicable

5. COMPLETE COMMUNITIES (Action Item) – 110 min. Brian Schoenfisch, Program Manager, Planning and Heidi Vonblum, Program Manager, Planning discussed changes to the program. Schoenfisch discussed the Housing Solutions component, highlighting Floor Area Ratio (FAR) based density. Schoenfisch thankedstakeholder for participation in the forum and mentioned the input received that resulted in the revisions, which include doubling the affordable housing requirement from 20 percent of the units to 40 percent; all affordable units are to be built on-sitenow, as opposed to some on-site and some off-site; replacement of any displaced affordable housing; the first 75 percent of affordable units located in a community of concern are to be first offered to those within one mile of the project to promote affordable housing in the community; any affordable units existing for past seven years to be restricted by covenant; half of neighborhood enhancement funds to be set aside for preservation of existing affordable housing; zoning must allow for at least 20 units per acre to be eligible for the program and transition zones eliminated; discretionary review has been added for projects over 95 feet in height; FAR reduced in employment areas from 8.0 to either 6.5 or 4.0 and 2.5 in the coastalzone; sunset clause built in; shortterm vacation projects excluded from program;

Heidi Vonblum said the underlying policy for Mobility is to provide a tailored approach to implement SB 743 to meet climate and equity in housing goals. Funds from development in Zones 2 and 3 and close to transit would be required to be invested in active transportation in those communities as they have the highest need. Whereas Zones 4 with the greatest amount of vehicular travel and located furthest from transit would require, an in-lieu fee to fund investment in active transportation in Zones 1, 2, 3 closest to transit. Feedback from the forum indicated that investment needed to be prioritized where they are most needed. So, 50 percent of the funding will be dedicated to communities of concern. Another outgrowth was an addition to the program allowing developers in Zone 4 to directlyprovide improvements in communities of concern. VB said PMP was modified based on public input including 500 letters. A standard to allow for innovative, thriving public places is sought as a goal. Where land is available acquisition is a priority. Points for shade have been included. The point system was revised to account for increased value of park space and is now 14 pts per 1,000 residents instead of 12. Emphasis on mental health aspects of open space and parks has beenadded. Park typologies have been expanded with potential to link communities through natural connections, as with watersheds. Clarification was added regarding standards, including that regional parks do not count toward population-based parks if they are not clearly accessible outside of a vehicle. Vonblum requested that public input has been valuable and should continue. The PMP will go to CityCouncil on Nov. 9 adopted by resolution only. Housing and Mobility will be adopted by ordinance and require a second reading.

Board Comment:

Main concerns included:

- Whether in-lieu fee in Zone 4 disadvantages residents in that zone?
 Staffreplied that the in-lieu fee is intended to be efficient in that it serves to offset vmt impact in the most vmt inefficient areas
- Definition of Transit Priority Zones is flawed. Staff replied that the definitionis consistent with state law
- How are communities of concern identified? Staff replied that City equitymaps show communities of concern
- Regarding Parks Master Plan, concern was expressed that acreage coulddecrease without a point value loss
- Will cultural and biological resources (MSCP) still be protected. Staff repliedthat PMP is intended to complement MSCP not replace it. Staff replied thatnothing in PMP overrides MSCP and would not allow MSCP open space for recreational use
- No net loss of park acreage was advocated
- Concern of commercialization of parks (i.e., food trucks) was expressed
- PC recommendations have not been incorporated into revised Housing, Mobility or Parks Master Plan
- CPG's have been excluded from process with program being rushedthrough for political purposes
- Points should be set by City Council for their districts and taken away fromPlanning Department, so elected reps have control

Motion:

TP moved to request City Council not approve Complete Communities until CPC, Recreation Advisory groups and CPG's have had enough time to review and makerecommendations, seconded by LJ. Ayes: CH, COL, GH, KT, LJ, LV, MRN, MV, NH,OM, PB, RB, RP, SR, TP, UN. Nays: UT. Abstain: 0. Motion passed 16-0-0 (UT ineligible), PEN did not vote.

9. REPORTS TO CPC:

- Staff Report- None
- Subcommittee Reports-None
- Chair's Report None
- CPC Member Comments None

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: NOVEMBER 24, 2020:

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Wally Wulfeck at 6:00 PM.