



## Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting Minutes

June 26, 2013

Attendees: Jon Becker, Joost Bende, Thom Clark, Bill Dumka, Steve Gore, John Keating, Mike Kenney, Jeanine Politte, Keith Rhodes, Mike Shoecraft, Dennis Spurr, Ramesses Surban, Zachary Tanton, Melinda Vasquez

Absent: Bill Diehl, Ruth Loucks, Cynthia Macshane, Darren Parker

Community Members & Guests (Voluntary Sign-in): John Leppert, Darshana Patel, Jacqui Higgs

---

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:39 pm at the Doubletree Golf Resort located at 14455 Peñasquitos Drive, San Diego, California 92129. A Quorum was present.

2. Agenda Modifications: none

3. Chairman Clark asked for volunteers to take the minutes; Shoecraft agreed.

4. MINUTES:

**Motion:** To approve the June 5, 2013 Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting minutes as presented. M/S/C - Dumka/Shoecraft/Approved, 8 in favor – 0 against – 3 abstentions (Bende (had not reviewed minutes), Becker and Spurr (absent)).

5. Guests:

a. No Public Safety Agencies present.

6. NON-AGENDA, PUBLIC COMMENTS: none

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. San Diego City Development Services Dept. Report – Michael Prinz

- Bill Fulton has been hired as the Director for the Dept. of Planning & Neighborhood Restoration (previously known as Development Services Division).

b. San Diego City Council Member Lorrie Zapf, District 6 Report – Conrad Wear

- Budget related items – Mayor Filner’s veto of the City Attorney budget increase was not overturned by a City Council vote. The reduction will result in the loss of a neighborhood prosecution unit.
- Managed Competition, approved by voters in 2006, has saved the City about \$10M this fiscal year. City employees have won every competition. The City Council reaffirmed their support for City projects.
- Code Compliance Issues: Recycling signs (not necessary illegal, based on location), mobile vehicle with advertising on side.
- Small storm water ground issue near Canyonside Park (actually a spring).

c. San Diego City Council Member Mark Kersey, District 5 Report – Lee Friedman

- Mark Kersey's community event at Rancho Peñasquitos Library just completed.
- Infrastructure: Getting condition assessments for City assets, that we still don't know what condition they are in. Sidewalk condition assessment will be completed this year.
- Increase to Police Force staffing, retention has been an issue, we have seen a 6.8% increase in crime in past year. Considering bonuses and incentives to improve retention.
- Budget: \$35M bond for infrastructure. \$10M for streets.

- Question from Jon Becker: Is there an initiative to add a position for an Urban Forester? Lee will get back to us.
  - Public safety, disaster preparedness, fire safety event planned for near future. Will coordinate with Fire Safe Council.
  - Walk planned at end of Calderon Rd at 4PM tomorrow, 27 June with Lee and members of Planning Board.
- d. San Diego County Supervisor Dave Roberts, District 3 Report – Tighe Jaffe, not present
- e. 77<sup>th</sup> Assembly District, Member Brian Maienschein's Office Report – Michael Lieberman, not present
- f. 52<sup>nd</sup> District, U.S. Congressman Scott Peters' Office Report – Hugo Carmona, not present

## 8. BUSINESS.

- a. **Proposed Community Plan Amendment Initiation for Torrey Highlands "Diocese property" (to change the land use designation of this property from Commercial Limited to Employment Center) – Robin Madaffer/Kilroy (Information Item)**
- Comments from Thom: Is the proposed change to the General Plan worthy of further analysis, using 3 criteria as provided by Michael Prinz:
    - 1) The amendment request is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan and Community Plan and any Community Plan Amendment criteria;
    - 2) The proposed amendment provides additional public benefit to the community, as compared to the existing land-use designation, density, intensity range, planned policy or site design;
    - 3) Public facilities appear to be available to serve the proposed increase in density/intensity or Their provision will be addressed as part of the amendment process. Denial is if it is consistent with the major goals and policies of the General Plan.
  - Michael Prinz: Example: An applicant was proposing building residential housing in open space. Only looking at land-use designation, not looking at any site specific issues or project specific issues related to design. What is land-use today, what is the proposed land-use change, and what are the impacts to the plans and community of those changes, based on the land-use itself, as opposed to a specific development application.
  - Robin Madaffer/Kilroy will be on the Sept. agenda.
- b. **Santaluz Assisted Living Project Update – Joe Taylor/ Santaluz, LLC (Information Item)**
- Jon Becker: This project has been on the agenda previously, and it has gone through major changes. Jon asked Michael to clarify the role that the Board played in review of it previously, versus these changes when we looked at the Sub-area Plan.
  - Michael Prinz: The application was provided to the Group, and the Group recommended approval of the assisted-living facility. Staff determined that a sub-area plan amendment was needed in order to complete the application, along with a conditional use permit process. At the most recent Planning Commission meeting, the applicant proposed a major re-design. Staff has reviewed this application and it has no change to the sub-area plan amendment component that is being processed.

- Joe Taylor: Approximately 2 years ago, most of the Board saw the plan with 80 units, we took everyone's recommendations and dropped this down to 64 units with 74 beds. We did come before the Board and did have 2 separate reviews and it was approved for recommendation to go forward to the Planning Commission. In 2012 we went before the Planning Commission and received permission to go forward and do further studies and finalize plans. Earlier this year we went to the Planning Commission 3 times: first time continued; second time there was a lot of community outpouring, we listened to them and the Planning Commission comments.

At the Feb. 14, 2013 meeting, we decided to take those comments and go back and do some redesign work to address those issues. The initial plan had 3 areas of access, which was a major concern with the steering committee (representatives from most local HOAs). The Steering Committee did not want to have 3 ingress and egress points, they wanted general parking behind the buildings, and were concerned with safety in the service area (trucks backing out into sidewalk and traffic).

We re-evaluated the entire site. This is not a substantial change, same number of units, same square footage, same parking area. The major change is re-positioning of building and access routes. We moved the building to allow only one point of access off Via Fiesta, with parking stalls behind the buildings and additional access going thru the project via existing private driveway, which currently serves the HOA, Church, and Montessori school. The property has a reciprocal agreement in place for private road access. The parking is now behind a wall and buildings. The memory-care facility has raised gardens for people to interact, this is a 2 story component (always was), also a 1 story component moved (has homes at a higher elevation, 1 story for lower visual impact). Very heavily landscaped. Another concern brought up was lower than 40 feet high (we were going to ask for height variance), we have modified elevation to less than 30 feet. We are retaining the Santaluz custom home design guidelines. We're still committed to project.

- Questions/Comments:

Becker: Landscape setback is 15 feet? Where are the walls?

Taylor: Yes, 15 feet, and pointed out 3 walls on drawing, they have not identified type and height yet. Solid walls with planting outside. Fence continues around the perimeter from the Montessori school. Fences are also internal so residents cannot wander out; memory care facility is enclosed.

Clark: Liked the way it steps up from 1 story at the street to 2 stories inside.

Keating: The driveway now circulates thru all the parking, which was a dead end before, and one had to back out. Circulation is way improved. From street, you're looking at buildings rather than parking, much more pleasing from street point of view.

Becker: Many different means to get out of the complex.

Clark: An earlier concern was service entry and trash, which is now internal.

Kenney: Do people want to go to an entrance in the back of the building?

Taylor: The operator and buyer are in-sink with this. Everyone who lives in this area is a potential resident . There will be address markers as we're expecting to pull from 3-5 mile radius.

Politte: I like the new flip, changes to building placement/layout. I have spent more time reading, watching Planning Commission video of this project, and with the letters we received; I was a little "ticked off" because this had been on the agenda, and Black Mtn. Ranch's planning seats were filled when we heard this project. Yet there are people in the neighborhood who did not have the information. I became very defensive based on what we had done, I can understand some of their points. We did our due diligence, we posted it, there is nothing I can do to get them to sign up for our e-mail distribution list. But we did have a number of residents from Black Mtn. Ranch and Santaluz on our e-mail distribution list. They chose not to pay attention, not to forward to neighbors, or participate. I was disappointed that come January all of these residents were filling out and signing petitions, including their children. These were a few of the things that kind of "burned me" on this. I like the change. You've made a great project better. I'd like to see you come back after you've made changes with Staff.

Taylor: We're done with cycle issues, just wrapping up right now.

Politte: With the conflict that you've had, if you find more opposition, because they've had more time. I think we need to offer support or recommendations to help the project move forward. If neighbors don't want to come and voice their opinion at our meeting when we make that decision, that's not our problem. I feel this fits and I would vote for it. If we support this again, with the changes, I think we need to document that.

Clark: I hope everyone got the letter and e-mail I forwarded. This is information that the community has concerns, and they've expressed them. Sitting on the board for part of the time, we had dialog, you've made changes, I voted on it based on the information I had at the time.

Bende: No matter what, someone is not going to be satisfied one way or other. I echo what Jeanine said. If you feel you need support of the Planning Board at the Planning Commission meeting, schedule yourself as an action item. You had our support before and you've made the project better. Thank you for making changes, it is a substantially better project.

Clark: Asked if there were any comments from the public?

Lisa Gomez comments: Lisa Gomez, an area resident, who lives approximately 1 block from the proposed Assisted Living/Memory Care Facility and a member of the Steering Committee, presented the objections of area residents to the facility and a

request that RPPB continue the matter until its next meeting so that RPPB can further consider the community's position and revote on the matter.

(Secretary's note: Please see attached "**TALKING POINTS RPPB Meeting 6/25/2013**")

Public Comments/Questions:

Patricia (BMR): Noted that homebuyers were told by builders that these lots would be a senior center and a recreation center.

Becker: It's my understanding as this project moved through the process and the project provides additional recreational facilities in the Santaluz community.

Lisa Gomez: That was presented at an RPPB meeting, the applicants position is that the recreational need has been offset by recreational facilities put within Santaluz. Santaluz is a gated community, this recreational facility would serve Santaluz and all the related communities. It's outside the gates. We're not sure what offsets within the gates are being considered, and that is something we've asked for more information on.

Kenney: An example mentioned in all the reports and minutes, is referred to recreational facilities, tot lots, dog park. I live a block and half from the dog park and I cannot use it, it is on Santaluz HOA property. Even residents of Santaluz can't use it, without paying a special fee in order to use it. All the facilities referred to, the club house, coffee place, gym; in order to be a member of that, you have to own a property in Santaluz. Certain information which may have been presented, was miss-construed by the board somehow and these facilities are not available to the general public.

Gore: Would we consider this as a change that would warrant the Board to re-evaluate and take action?

Becker: As chair at the time when this moved forward, we were presented and evaluated the same facts that we knew of, that the applicant had, that we had, with the BMR and Santaluz sub-area plan. I don't see anything new other than the site plan itself, but in response to pining on the sub-area plan, those have already been there, that is the same information.

Gore: With regard to what we would normally vote on, none of that has been changed? There hasn't been substantial changes in this plan that would warrant a re-visit?

Clark: Correct. And after listening to the Plan now, I have not seen that change.

Becker: To the neighbors, we're an advisory to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission can take its own course.

Lisa Gomez: Can I hand out to you the COW 2013 guideline, which talks about when a vote might be appropriate, and it's not just substantial changes, also new information?

Clark: Tonight's just for information only, I don't know that it's appropriate.

**Motion: That this item be continued until our next meeting and that it be put on the agenda as an action item, mainly per COW 2013, page C55.**  
**IKenney/ no second /Motion failed for lack of a second.**

Clark: Joe, is this the plan that was presented to the Planning Commission?

Taylor: No.

Alan Haynie: Two observations:

1) I think you have to take great care when a project goes through the process and comes before you multiple times, when you take an action. If somebody comes in with arguments that could have been made in that process, if you characterize that as new information that requires you to hold another hearing, it's going to be an endless circle, it's going to happen again, and again, and would encourage people not to participate the first time.

2) With respect to changes in the project, these are the sort of changes you want to have happen and if these kind of changes and responses to Planning Commission concerns, and we heard some things from the Planning Commission. For example, they were worried about the deviation finding, some expressed concern about the height. That's why we got rid of it, so they didn't have to worry about that issue. But, if you discourage people from making changes that are a direct response to a the Planning Commission or the community as they are going through the process, that would be a real travesty. You want to encourage this without the price of having to go back in front of the Planning Board. We think we did something really good here.

Clark: It sounds like you're going to present to the Planning Commission and get approval or denial. From my perspective, having voted on this several times, that I was acting on the best information that I had at the time. I think we asked you questions, you changed things, the dialogue was there, and with the information that we had from the city and from us, I acted in what I thought was in the best interest of this project in the community and how it related to the sub-area plan.

c. **Proposed Community Plan Amendment Initiation for 'Rhodes Crossing' – Keith Rhodes/Rhodes Crossing (Information Item)**

- I was not really ready to initiate a Plan Amendment, but when Kilroy came forward I thought it was important to look at everything that might be around Kilroy. Kilroy's project is in Torrey Highlands and anything I'm talking about is in Peñasquitos. This map shows the City directed density intensification. Leaving 209 units here, 242 units there, while this is 3 unit and 68 units area, and this is 342 units and down here are 40 units of garden style. This originally zoned single family area will remain single family, which has the area I'd like to look at. We originally see that 2 4-story wrap products here (wrap product meaning that the parking is inside and the apartments are build around that, so you can drive up to the foyer, park, and walk in). I would also be looking for a multiple family area. So, the two areas total 591 units of multi-family. This will now be 29 units of single-family on these 2 lots. There were 36, but when I went back to get my permits, it became 29 because of the

enjoyment, due to the environmental permits adding 6 more lots to avoid a 4-story product. I'm thinking of a 3-story product. Part of it has to do with the need for density. Is it close to the interchange, yes, and is there capacity for it in the traffic study? We did our traffic study based on the greater.

There is a 1.3 acre private park that's supposed to be used by the public part of time. We're having a problem when we look at that of having a private park that's used by the public. There's a real liability issue, there's a problem insuring it, and those kind of things. The idea is, if you put 40 units down here, there could be some developer contribution that could be used for new and existing parks, to do things that you can't do right now. When I talked about the FBA fees, I made a mistake, as Torrey Highlands has a much higher fee than Peñasquitos, and I used that fee, which is \$95,277 this year, 60% of that is for multi-family. In Peñasquitos, it's probably around \$45K for single family and \$27K, 60% of that is for multi-family. So, the 40 units down here would probably be \$1,080,000 for FBA fees on top of whatever developer contribution is decided on. These 30 units of single family would be about \$1,350,000, as I just used 270 to go thru the process, because you have to do 10% for affordable housing, that I didn't include that when I did this map. You'd have to see how it all works out, financially. I would put the affordable in this area with market area as well. So, that would turn out to be about \$7,290,000, rather than the \$1,350,000 for single family, that's there now.

Using a the developer contribution fee from the 40 units could be used for parks and I would be happy to talk to the Recreation Board about that idea. The density is right now around 342. This density is in the map, as approved at 342. What I would be looking at is about 270. It was suggested there be a sub-committee and look at this and I would think that's appropriate. I would not ask the committee to approve my changing the zoning on this, but for the community to know as much as you want to know before I did that. I don't want to go out there and try this and have the community not interested in it at all.

- Questions/Comments:

Bende: Just a recap, maybe I missed something, but number 2 on your map, that is in your approved plan today, that is multi-family?

Rhodes: It's single family.

Bende: That backs up against existing single family?

Rhodes: Yes, it backs up against existing single family.

Bende: Is it your proposal now to make it into multi-family?

Rhodes: The difference is that this street starts about 10 feet below this level here, then it has a little rise, and then it drops down considerably. So, the people, you can't see out of your first floor for most of these units along here. It's a slope with a wood fence at the top. I'm sure we're going to be required, I would imagine when this is developed this area, there will be a requirement to put some kind of, cause right in here this is part of the preserve, there is vernal pools in here, so there's a linear portion in here behind these homes in here, that is going to be, in perpetuity, be in its natural state for vernal pools. This is a vernal pool preserve here, and this is a vernal pool preserve here.

Bende: Where that street travels, in the white part, the street travels east-west when you go up Via Panacea, is that Dormouse over there?

Rhodes: Right now Carmel Mtn. Rd. and Via Los Lenas are the 2 entrances. Whatever is built here will give a second fire entrance here rather than having them close together, so you only have one entrance up here, this one will be designed so you can get out this way in case of fire.

Gore: Had you had this proposed community plan amendment for some time ago, or just recently?

Rhodes: I've been thinking about it for a while. It's not something we just came up with. As we've had loans on this property for a long time, since 2002.

Jacqui Higgs: This was a proposal the we went through and discussed, ad nauseam, in front of this board, years ago?

Rhodes: This is different, plus we'd go through a sub-committee to look at it, this is not what was proposed before, that was 382 units. Now, this would not be a 4-story, this is a garden and a 3-story.

Jacqui Higgs: There is no wall at the top of this street.

Rhodes: I just walked it today, there is a 5 or 6 foot wood fence. I'm sorry, let me understand what you're asking?

Jacqui Higgs: You referred to the fact that they could not look out their windows and see this division behind them, at the top of that street they definitely can.

Rhodes: What I said was from here and here, you can't see from your first story. That's getting into a lot more detail than I meant to, but what I said that there is a 5 foot wood fence here right now. We're probably going to be required, as a development, whatever goes in there, to put a fence along here, because of the vernal pool preserve right in here. At least along there, we'll have to have probably a 6 foot block wall.

Clark: Let me bring it back around, it's under the business item as a community plan amendment. At this point that would be vetted out through a different process.

Jacqui Higgs: I thought I was completely familiar with the process, I thought this was a completely approved plan that would not change going forward?

Politte: When you saw it the last time, I don't think the vernal pools and all of the enjoyment areas had happened yet.

Rhodes: When we put more density on here, this is what we came forward with. Then when SANDAG says you don't need any density anymore, then the community said, this will be single family, but I think there is an opportunity here that the community is not going to be hurt by it. But, that's a whole other process.

Bende: Once again for Keith and for the general public at large, I think it would help if you brought, and put up on the wall what the approved map is, what your current entitlement is, and then make comparisons from the current entitlement.

Rhodes: That's fine Joost, and I made it very clear that there are 30 single-family homes here, I said that every time.



Bende: I understand, you've been honest and up-front and you've said it was an earlier map, and the approved map is a little further down the road from this one. For the clarity of the conversation, and what we're comparing it to in terms of what is now approved, and what you're entitled for, and what's now part of the community plan, and what you're looking to change in the community plan, as it stands today, to what you want it to become.

Rhodes: At this point, I don't disagree with that. In fact a sub-committee would be formed. These are just my initial thoughts. I think I've been very up front, comparably, to anybody else.

Becker: I think a sub-committee would serve this well, there's a lot of parts, a lot of details, and a lot of community concern.

Rhodes: If the Board doesn't want it, I want to hear that up front. I'm content going home. I'm older than I'd like to say, and I don't want to become the dirty developer that I suddenly became when I brought my project forward.

Clark: I want to wrap-up and move on. Are there any other questions from the public?

Patricia (BMR): Is there a commercial component?

Rhodes: There is 250,000 square feet of commercial here in Torrey Highlands. It's still planned, but I'm not talking about that now. In Torrey Highlands, there's 242 units, there's a sub-storage area right here, and a lot here, but how it will turn out, I don't know. I'm just talking about this area in Peñasquitos, which we feel is going to be a real problem to deal with.

Bende: Just as a frame of reference, the Arch-Diocese property is outlined in green.

Rhodes: The Arch-Diocese property is right here, it's across from my commercial. In fact, my entrances are right here and here. They used to be single line intersections, and the top one used to be further south, until the Diocese asked me if I'd line them up, so they could have two signalized entrances to get out, and I said I would, and that's why they line up, because I was doing a favor for the Diocese.

Jacqui Higgs: I'm trying to understand why the changing of the Kilroy property is requiring you to revisit the density.

Rhodes: What Kilroy's doing, in these areas are what we've thought about doing on our property right here. When Kilroy came in with this, I didn't think it was proper. The Board has always wanted to look at the entire area, so that if I'm looking at the possibility of changes, it forced me to come out and say look, these are changes I'm looking at, that I would like the community to know about, so this isn't in isolation.

Gore: Keith, are you really serious, or is there some kind of message you're giving to us, because all of a sudden the southern area of Torrey Highlands is a miss-mash of Kilroy wanting to change the Community Plan, and you wanting to change the Community Plan. It's all happening all at the same time.

Rhodes: These are things that we wanted to talk to the community about. We would not have come forward at this particular time, had it not been for Kilroy. We think everything that is a potential out there should be looked at too.

Becker: One of the things to that point, Steve, if there is going to be something of a change, they should all be looked at, so there isn't cumulative impacts, that occurred just by looking at one in isolation. You want to make sure, if there was something to occur on this site, something to occur on the Diocese site, that the whole system doesn't implode, that it works together, and that there is some mechanism there to monitor it.

Rhodes: There are times to bring things forward. We've been looking at this area down here, and what to do with it. This went to about 4 lots in this area right here,. Where we had at one time 25 lots now there are 4 and a park, a 1.3 acre park. We're looking for ways that make sense, so the community plan might make sense. If it's done right, the community will like it, and it would benefit everybody. We've been thinking about this for a long time, and we would like more time to think about it before we come forward, but when somebody comes forward with a project that's going to be at least 300,000 square feet of commercial and you don't know what kind of commercial, it's time to say, we're out here too.

Jacqui Higgs: I just need to know what the next steps will be for the community?

Clark: The next step will be that I'm going to ask for a sub-committee to be set up, and I want to ask somebody to head it, and I want a name with it, along with a couple of other ad-hoc committees. I want to tackle them all at one. That will be the next thing, it will be a group meeting in discussing it.

d. **RPPB Vacancies (PQ Dist. 6, 7 & TH 2) / Member Appointments** – Thom Clark/RPPB (Action Item)

- Town Council has submitted a letter appointing their representative for their new fiscal year; Cyndy Macshane will serve as a rep to RPPB from July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014. Clark accepted the appointment and Macshane will remain as the Town Council rep.
- Clark reviewed the three vacant seats adding that we had received Melinda Vasquez's application for District 7. He introduced Vasquez and she provided some background about herself and the reasons she wanted to join RPPB. Clark acknowledging his desire to appoint Vasquez to the seat, asked for a motion.

**Motion: To approve the appointment and seat Melinda Vasquez to the Rancho Peñasquitos District 7 seat for the remainder of the term (2013-2015). M/S/C – Politte/Becker/Approved, 13 in favor – 0 against – 0 recusals/abstentions.**

- Politte added that the other two seats remain vacant, District 6 and one in Torrey Highlands, and she will include notice of the vacancies with the September meeting agenda and include applications one last time until we send out 2014 election info. Members can still share the vacancies via word of mouth, let Clark know; he can contact the prospective appointee and forward an application.

9. **REPORTS.**

a. **Chair Report – Thom Clark**

- Ad Hoc Committees, Chair appointments:
  1. Arch-Diocese/Kilroy Property: Thom Clark
  2. Rhodes Crossing: Jon Becker

3. Rancho Peñasquitos Community Plan Amendment to remove the widening of Black Mtn. Rd. from SR-56 to Mercy Rd.: Mike Kenney
  - o Jeanine said that Bill Dumka was also working on this (PQ & BMR PFFP/FBAs).
  - CPC meeting: Discussion was on CIP, which is to be completed by Oct 1. Jeff Johnson, consultant to City, is working on Applications for City and CIP. Community outreach is important. RPPB web page in development.
  - CIP Priority Process sub-committee meeting in July to get organized.
  - Master Bike Plan update & EIR
- b. Vice-Chair Report – Jon Becker
  - Becker noted that contact lists for planning group still have him listed for BMR & TH; Politte will notify staff again to make change to Clark.
  - Bike Sharing Program in early 2014: Bicycles at sites throughout City, available to borrow to promote more use of bikes for transportation and reduce carbon.
  - Keating added, a Bike Awareness Day is planned for August 11<sup>th</sup>; will be set up down 30th street from Golden Hill area to Adams Ave.
- c. Acting Secretary Report – Jeanine Politte, Mike Shoecraft no report
- d. Standing Committee Reports:
  - Land Use (Ramesses Surban)
    - Kilroy project
    - Rhodes Crossing
    - Politte noted contact with Sandra Teasley, Proj. Mgr. for the Khouli Residences; no permits have been issued yet.
  - Telecomm (Darren Parker) – no report
- e. Ad Hoc Committee Reports:
  - FBA/PFFP Prioritization (Keith Rhodes) – no report
  - Doubletree Resort (Jeanine Politte)
    - Politte asked Becker if he had received a response from Urban Forestry yet on the tree topping.
      - Becker noted that the budget in Urban Forestry did not include funds for code enforcement.
  - Santa Fe Summit II & III (Darren Parker)
    - Brian Brady (Kilroy) provided the following info:
      - o The Caltrans/City of San Diego agreement is being revised due to changes in required Caltrans language. Once completed, Kilroy is ready to move forward on the T-9 Bridge design.
      - o Santa Fe Summit II & III is about a year out from breaking ground; tenant interest is starting to pick up.
  - RPPB Electronic Media Site (Steve Gore)
    - Will coordinate next meeting with CIP sub-committee meeting, 1/2 hour meeting.
    - Now loading information into the web site.
  - Community Funds (Bill Diehl) – no report
- f. Liaison and Organization Reports:
  - Black Mountain Open Space Park (Bill Diehl) – no report

- MCAS Miramar Community Leaders Forum (Dennis Spurr)
  - June: daytime Squadron visit
  - May: Hospital Corpsman presentation on battlefield injuries improvements.
- PQ Fire Safe Council (Dennis Spurr/Mike Shoecraft)
  - Board Meeting July 18, Doubletree Patio
- PQ Town Council (Cynthia Macshane) – no report
- PQ Recreation Council (Steve Gore) – no report
- Los Pen Canyon Psv CAC (John Keating)
  - The CAC officers are working through some issues; no meeting in a while.
- Park Village LMAD (Jon Becker)
  - Recent walk-about, new priorities, recent plantings. Will be replacing some street trees.
- Peñasquitos East LMAD (Bill Diehl) – no report
- Torrey Highlands LMAD (Darren Parker)
  - Gore reported that City Engineers have not returned with final documents for Community Signs review; concerned with the length of time it is taking.
  - Trash containers placed by the LMAD have been helpful in reducing the amount of litter needing to be picked up near Mobile Station and Westview High School.
- Transportation Agencies (John Keating)
  - John rode the 56 Bike Trail from Coaster Station in Sorrento Valley to Sabre Springs with the City's Bike coordinator, Tom Landry, and CALTRAN's bike coordinator, Seth Cutter.
  - March issues distributed to City, CALTRANs, and City Council District Reps: CALTRANs response received, RPPB response prepared for RPPB review before Sep. meeting. Awaiting City's response.
  - CALTRANs proposes guardrails on 56 Bike Path to be placed where bike path is within 30 feet of 56 freeway. John's response asks them to re-assess criteria, look where accidents have been, where accidents might be, and where we can get more cost-effective protection with metal guardrails instead for concrete wall.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Shoecraft and Jeanine Politte

Approved 10/2/2013; 8 in favor – 1 against (Rhodes) – 4 abstentions (Diehl, Loucks, Tanton, Valentine)

**TALKING POINTS**  
**RPPB Meeting**  
**6/25/2013**

My name is Lisa Gomez. I live approximately 1 block from the proposed Assisted Living/Memory Care Facility. I am a member of a Steering Committee that represents hundreds of community residents and concerned parents opposing the proposed facility.

We could have brought an army tonight. However, because you have advised us that your procedures do not allow you to vote on this matter, the Steering Committee asked me to attend on behalf of the opposition to make the community's concerns known.

By way of background, I have spent the majority of the past 15+ years representing developers, first as an environmental attorney, and then on the business side overseeing the environmental and land use departments of two major California utilities. I also served as a White House appointee under the Clinton, Bush and Obama administrations to a senior level advisory committee to USEPA that advised USEPA on various issues, including Smart Growth. I have never before opposed a project. However, I strongly oppose this project for several reasons.

When your Board approved the original project on September 7, 2011, very few residents in the surrounding neighborhoods had any knowledge of it. When we received notice that the Planning Commission intended to hold a hearing on the project, the community had major concerns and requested a continuance. The Planning Commission granted a two week continuance.

During these two weeks, we met with the applicant and researched similar projects. The more we learned, the more concerned we became. Within a matter of a few days, nearly 400 residents signed a petition opposing the project. Ultimately, when the matter went back to the Planning Commission on January 31<sup>st</sup>, after approximately 50 minutes of community testimony opposing the project, the majority of the Planning Commissioners voted to recommend that City Council DENY the project. The applicant pulled its application shortly thereafter.

The applicant has now resubmitted the project with **three significant changes**: (1) the structure will no longer exceed the Municipal Code's height restriction; (2) the project's access, parking, dumpster and delivery areas have been moved; and (3) the setbacks from the sidewalk have been decreased to allow for internal parking. These changes raise new issues for consideration, and do not address the fundamental reasons that the community is opposed to the project. Those reasons include:

1. When area residents purchased our homes, we relied on the Subarea Plan's designation of these lots as a senior day center and recreation facility. These uses would have provided recreational and social opportunities that ALL residents could enjoy. Now, the applicant is trying to combine the lots and redesignate them to a private 24/7 commercial operation that would not afford residents any of the social or recreational opportunities we had anticipated.

## TALKING POINTS

### RPPB Meeting

6/25/2013

2. The facility is a massive, urban commercial operation that is incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood as to bulk, scale and size. The facility would cram 71,584-square feet onto a small 3.28-acre site. It would combine two lots and use nearly every permissible square foot of buildable area for a single structure.
3. The facility is incompatible with and creates significant safety concerns for the children who attend the adjacent schools. The facility would be sandwiched between a pre-school to the south and an elementary school to the north. Over 1000 children travel to and from these schools on a daily basis during the week, often on foot or bike. Our research suggests that the facility would generate approximately 6.5 EMS calls per week, or roughly 1 EMS call per day every day of the year. EMS calls present significant hazards. According to NHTSA, EMS vehicles deliver 5,000 crashes per year, resulting in one fatality every 10 days, including approximately 4 child fatalities per year. Given these statistics, it is clearly negligent to put a project that generates 1 EMS call per day on a street that over 1000 small children use – often on foot and bike.
4. The facility is not necessary. The Subarea Plan designates a far superior 30-acre site approximately 1 mile north of the proposed site for continuing care, including assisted living and memory care.

The only entity that supported the project at the Planning Commission hearing who was not affiliated with the project has withdrawn its support of the project.

Also, nine residents have sued the City in connection with the City Staff's early determination that it could allow a nursing facility on Proposition A Land even though the Municipal Code clearly states that nursing facilities shall not be allowed on Proposition A Land.

The community is asking the RPPB to revote on the project in light of this new information. in Article II, Section 2, of RPPB's Bylaws state: "Upon receipt of plans for projects with substantive revisions, the planning group may choose to rehear the project and may also choose to provide a subsequent formal recommendation to the City." The *Community Orientation Workshop Handbook* (COW) at page 55 similarly provides that community planning groups may vote on projects more than once when, for example, a project has been substantially revised ... or the planning group has received incorrect or significant new information on the project impacts to the community. Here, we have BOTH conditions that expressly allow RPPB to vote again. The COW further states, "when a community planning group wants to revote on a matter originally voted upon at a prior meeting, due to project revisions or new information, a motion to reverse or modify a previous position at a subsequent meeting can be made by any member."

In conclusion, we are requesting that RPPB continue the matter until its next meeting so that RPPB can further consider the community's position and revote on the matter.