

Karl Rand

From: Karl Rand <karlrاند22@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2020 9:14 AM
To: Karl Rand
Subject: Fwd: [PBPG Board] PBPG Minutes and Updated Notes for Nov 11, 2020

*PBPG MINUTES
NOVEMBER 11, 2020*

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Carolyn Chase <carolyn@icontactweb.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 20, 2020 at 11:05 AM
Subject: [PBPG Board] PBPG Minutes and Updated Notes for Nov 11, 2020
To: PBPG <board@pbplanning.org>

Minutes and Notes
from the Pacific Beach Planning Group
meeting on Wednesday, November 11, 2020:
held via Zoom Conference

Attending via Zoom:

- 1 Ed Gallagher
- 2 Marcella Bothwell. Chair Dev Projects Review
- 3 Karl Rand, Chair
- 4 Steve Pruett
- 5 Jason Legros, Vice Chair
- 6 Joe Bettles
- Pouria Parsa & +1
- Dave Schab
- 7 Carolyn Chase, Secretary
- Stephanie Green, Columbia Care
- 8 Jessie Beckman
- Regina Sinsky-Cro
- Victoria Cohen
- Greg Daunoras
- Brian Longmore
- Eve Anderson
- 6:20pm
- Gabriel Roseman
- Josh Black, Columbia Care
- Jim Gottlieb
- John Muller, Columbia Care
- Tim Openwell
- Gordon
- Chris Brewster
- Brian Curry
- 9 Jonathan Cole quorum at 6:32pm

Nicholas Caezza, Columbia Care
Denise Friedman
Warren Barrett
Call to order here
Eva S
10 Brian Delon
11 Scott Chipman
12 Paula Gondolfo
Katie Matchett
Kevin Vincent
13 Jim Morrison
Daniel Kramer
Sara Berns at 7pm and 37 attending online
Ron Walker
Karin Zirk at 7:21pm
Gabriel Roseman

Absent members: Grant LeBeau, Adrienne Gallo, Brian White, Junior Leoso

Item 1

Quorum Count (17 Group members, 9 is a quorum) - a quorum was established at:
Called to Order at 6:33pm with 29 people online & the Chair introduced our group and explained our advisory role with the City of San Diego

Item 2 Non-Agenda Public Comment began at 6:36pm

Issues not on the Agenda and within the jurisdiction of PBPG.

- Ed Gallagher - Grateful for the good works of our group
- Eve Anderson - Block Captain's report - sent out our first two newsletters; working with M Tello (D2 staff) and on tree trimming - we got one trimmed and hope to get blocks done;.... please wear a mask!
- Scott Chipman - advocating at STRSolutions.info to work on solutions to Short Term Rentals
- Jason Legros - Happy Veteran's Day and thanks to the three members who have served: Paula (Navy), Brian (Army) and Karl (Army) thank you for your service and to all others listening and also to my father who served in the Navy in Vietnam from 1967-1971.
- Paula Gondolfo - Credibility Counts. This isn't personal it's business - and the business of this board is the safety and habitability of our Community . For neighbors, visitors and businesses. Without degrading the local habitat-watersheds, bays, ocean... park, etc.

And - credibility counts. In any organization, credibility can be measured qualitatively. It's seen, modeled by leadership at all levels.

Credibility is reliable, consistent. There are those among us who embrace the changes and advocate for the safety and security of this community. Our QOL. In spite of our fear and loathing at these inevitable changes.

AND as things evolve and change. There are those of us who see the community changing to support Our Community's needs. We're Acting Local. And preserving a Regional gift, an Ocean. PB is a living entity that will benefit from thoughtful and comprehensive planning . We want sustainable growth and an effective collaborative Board who upholds our QOL values. And constraints and opportunities in our neighborhoods are balanced with community character - per Us - the people who live and work here. For the good of the Region.-

Item 3 Current Agenda - Modifications and Approval at 6:44pm

Motion to Approve JC/SP Agenda of November 11, 2020 without modifications; Approved without objection

Item 4 September 9, 2020 Minutes - Modifications and Approval at 6:46pm

Motion to Approve EG/SP Minutes of Sept 9, 2020 without modifications Approved with objection.

Item 5 – 6:40 Development Project Reviews (Action Item) at 6:47pm

The Chair reviewed the procedure for reviewing Action Items.

1. a report from the Chair
2. Presentation by the Applicant
3. Consider motion/s
4. Questions from the Board, brief, clarifying that might affect your vote
5. Public comment, if any
6. Board discussion on the Motion

The Chair will call each member who will be allowed to speak prior to anyone speaking twice and members may decide not to comment when called upon

The Chair introduced the project at 6:50pm

#662571: De Soto Cannabis Outlet CUP Amendment and Renewal

Description: Process 2 Technical Conforming Amendment to an existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Columbia Care Dispensary located at 4645 De Soto Street, to change it from a Medical Marijuana Consumer Cooperative (MMCC) to a Cannabis Outlet (CO), and to renew the CUP for a second five year period. No changes to the building or the business operations are proposed. The City has changed the type of permits that they issue, so this is a “technical” amendment in that you cannot get the existing permit renewed you have to change to this new one.

Development Subcommittee Chair Marcella Bothwell reported that the committee consisting of KR, JL and MB who voted 3-0 to recommend approval at their November meeting. And there will be more of these permits coming into our area. There is a new SanDiego.gov webpage for cannabis information See Info Bulletin 170 that was posted in July 2020 and the Muni Code 141.0504 determines restrictions and requirements. Zoned IS-1-1, Transit Area.

Presenter: Stephanie Green began at 6:54pm, Program Manager

Introduced staff; showed map of 1,000 ft sensitive zone requirement and 100-ft setback requirement; located on private property on all sides and access is via Price Self Storage property. Will be walkable from the new trolley station and has bike parking. Showed landscape design and existing 2,740 sq ft floor plan and photos of exterior. Has worked on some Community Collaborations and want to do more. They are in compliance with all applicable plans, regs and zones. Presentation completed at 7:03pm

Motion to approve EG/SP #662571: De Soto Cannabis Outlet CUP Amendment and Renewal Passed without objection at 7:05pm

Item 6 – 7:10 PB Parking Advisory Committee Presentation: (Action Item)

The Chair introduced the proposal that was heard last month and postponed.

Regina Sinsky-Crosby, Board member of Beautiful PB and who lives in Crown Point will present again on the current proposal for a pilot program for paid parking on a portion of Garnet Avenue and adjacent streets. Began at 7:08pm

Asking for support for the Paid Parking Pilot Program

Community Parking District was established in 2005 with an oversight Adv Board with the 4 main community groups and 4 at-large members.

Limited to commercial zones with 2hr and less time limits. Price flexing will not exceed city max of \$2.50/hour Without a CPD, communities do not receive any parking revenues. Under the CPD 20% goes to City admin.

Then 80% is split 45% to CPD and 55% to City and the City can adjust it when convinced.

Projects must fund to improve or increase avail, supply and effectivness of parking for residents, visitor and businesses within 1/4mile (?) of the zone

Would go to City Council for approval. She presented a map of the Area and Parking Space count. Presented the estimated budget based on \$1/rate and community could receive hundreds of thousands (missed the exact estimate).

Reported on Community Outreach and media - of written feedback: 18 oppose and 15 support and 3 were neutral shared feedback from businesses

Presentation will be available online pbparking.org where you can also provide feedback or pacificbeachcpd@gmail.com

At 7:16pm Joe Bettles, PBPG rep to the CPD report on how parking management and revenue can change the way we move around PB. We have high walking scores and we have biking too; we know PB is congested. It's not just a convenience issue, it can be dangerous. PB has been identified - at Garnet at Mission is the third most dangerous intersections in the City.

1. Manage parking - parking meters can reduce cruising for spots that brings down congestion. Expensive off-street and free on-street increases cruising and congestion. By pairing paid parking with alternatives you can make a big impact.

2. Provide Alternatives - trolley is coming - but how to get there?
Provide an alternative route in and out of PB
Fast, frequent, reliable is what gets people to change to transit.
Bring back the Sunrunner! Address congestion; progress on community goals, alternative to driving, runs with sun

Daniel Karmer from Circuit took over at 7:22pm
Circuit uses electric vehicles to provide a free rides within the coverage area; uses an app to request and you can wave them down; they pool rides; cars have advertising; reduces solo car-use. Currently operating in downtown with a geofencing system. They can set up virtual stops or just provide rides within the zone by request. Collects data to learn and improve performance. Nimble, flexible service. Operating in more than 20 cities; Have provided more than 3 million rides; A+ Insured.

Brian Curry took over at 7:27pm We have a great opportunity and have been trying to do this for a long time. We have a Council member who will support a pilot program. Consistent with PB Ecodistrict. Provides many benefits related to sustainability and discourages cars - when you don't need to use them. It would allow for more parking turnover and that really needed. This is a one-year pilot program; Discover PB and Beautiful PB and PB Town Council have all approved this they are all members of are community supportive of this. They all have our community in mind for improvements. The three PBPG planning group members are in favor of this. The City give us \$1. We have budget deficits and infrastructure deficits and this is our opportunity to get a beneficial source of funds. It's a change. We're not the sleepy little beach town that we were. The main thing that's missing is improvements to our business district. ... I understand that some people are against it and I get that, but we need the improvements, it's only a pilot program and if it doesn't work well, we'll end it, but I ask you to support giving it a try. End at 7:33pm

Motion by JM/JC to endorse the Pilot Parking program as presented

Jason L - what gaurantees prevent the City from taking the money

A - they'd have to return to Council and the Mayor would also have to support changing it. This is a program they've had for a long time.

Paula G - would PB retain control on how it's spent?

A - yes

Public Comment open at 7:36pm

Gordon Froelich - served as one of the at-large members of the Parking Adv Board; the committee was rigged; the people I talk to in the neighborhoods don't want it....only 37% in a survey of 800 were in favor of it. ... once they go in, they'll never come out, there will be more and you'll need a lot more to run that shuttle - which is a nice idea. Businesses are against it, will parking meters encourage customers? This will not be good as business try to recover from the pandemic...competitors in other areas have free parking and our businesses will have a disadvantage; It's sends a bad message that we don't want people - that you have to pay to come here. Why do the big stores have big lots that are free? The committee was a fraud, please stop this.

Tom Page called to speak at 7:43, but he's not online

Pouria Parsa - we agree the extent of congestion and it's a problem, but if you do put parking meters, then the congestion may move into the community. The last thing I would want would be to move it from the main drive to where we all live.

Kevin Vincent - Resident of the impact zone on and I express my strong support; it may make it more expensive for myself and my guests but I think it's a win-win and research shows it provides a lot of benefits to the biz in the area.

Strongly in favor.

Greg Denourus - I do support the pilot program and have 3 logistical questions: hours of ops, hourly rate and designated locations and suggestions. My questions were killed and I'm a bit disappointed.

Katie Matchett - PB resident and member of the Parking Board and President of Beautiful PB and was part of the original creation of the CPD. This is really about sustainability. It will reduce pollution, reduce congestion...we may get some things wrong and we can tweak it, even if it means taking it away.... it's time to take some action.

Warren Barrett - the overwhelming majority of the community is opposed to paid parking in PB and the Parking Board knows it. They've been trying to do this for 15 years. They're trying to sneak this through during the pandemic and it's despicable. A handful of people with their own interests is going to impact thousands negatively. The meeting announcements in the Beach & Bay Press was tiny. We didn't elect them to make these decision! Please vote against this.

Kristen Victor - Full support of the parking meters. The revenue income stream is critical for a clean, safe and sustainable PB. My biz is in the pilot area and so is my husband's and we are in full support.

Gabriel Roseman - what are the metrics of success / what criteria will be used?

End of public comments at 7:52pm

Call of members

Jessie B - strongly in favor - can solve a huge issue here and the data is on this side; I live in the impact area and support the good things over the inconvenience.

Joe B - yes

MB - presentation is getting better; don't live in the impact zone but I park there going to support

CDC - going to support

SC - this is hard for me and I'm probably going to vote no; I've followed this and people have been overwhelmingly opposed. We need to see the plan that's going to be funded rather than just getting the money and letting a few people decide how it's spent. ...they are primarily repping the businesses and many people don't really support our biz district; I've seen a lot of people going up to Clairemont Square instead of locally; places with meters do have congestion - I don't believe it reduced congestion.

Jonathan Cole - I'm a resident and a biz owner and our office is in the impact area and I will be voting yet.

BD - I think there will be a lot of violations; a lot will take their chance on getting a ticket; fearful that the City will renege on the agreement and we might not get the % we're supposed too; am concerned it will get people to cruise into the community, but I am going to support the pilot.

EG - I sincerely hope all the promises of the program come to fruition and from that perspective I'm strongly supportive. However, I share community concerns about potential negative impacts. I would be more supportive if the pilot had a clear end with more clear success metrics. I don't like to sign contracts without "exit clauses". The meters go in and then the community must fight to remove them. The "roll-back" of the test must be baked-in to the pilot. I don't see that here.

If it's a huge success — as advocates believe — the support to extend it will be overwhelming. If the program is a disaster — as many fear — then the community should not have to do anything; the meters are removed and the experiment is over. That's the way to structure a pilot program in a way I could support.

PG - voting yes

Jason L - skeptical about long-term prospects of revenue sharing. I support it in principle and the aims it wishes to achieve. Given the lack of representation I'm symbolically voting no to represent that.

Jim M - None of the committee has a financial interest in this. parking turnover will help local businesses. We are the 6h largest city and we have growing pains; we need to address this and I know it's an emotional issue and I recall being a child in the 60s here and we need to help all the interests involved.

Steve P - I would like to see a clear definition of success and there should be multiple metrics - usage, revenue, impacts on other community parking - there are several. Also parking is a different challenge in August than in February. We're in the best beach community...and we will continue to have lots of visitors and biz that are here need our support to optimize what's here. Change comes with pain; the plan is not perfect but you have to start somewhere and be open to adapting it. I'm going to trust there will be the metrics and I'm going to support it.

Concludes Roll Call

8:09 Move the previous question to endorse the Paid Parking program by SP/MB Voting no: Jason L

9-3-0 with Jason L, Scott C and Ed G voting no; Motion passes

8:11pm

Item 7 – 8:00 PBPG Chair's Report by Karl Rand by 8:11pm

Thanks to the Roberts Rules Consultant who I have been consulting with and I'm going to propose we get copies of a useful version

3535 Promontory Appeal, no update

STVR Update - moved to Dec 3 Planning Commission hearing

Item 8 – 8:10 Streets & Sidewalks Subcommittee (Informational)

Chair's Report: Jessie Beckman will provide a report on the October 28

Subcommittee meeting and the status of ongoing projects began at 8:13pm

Brief meeting last month, no new items, 3 in attendance and we discussed the proposed pocket park on Tourmaline that was supported at the last meeting. Three PB Middle School students are eager to get involved. A Committee is being put together to work on the project. If interested let her know.

Need to reschedule the Nov meeting - she'll send out a notice

Joe Bettles - Read from a letter from the Fire Chief for supporting parking for lifeguards, "greatly appreciated"

Item 9 – 8:20 Complete Communities and Parks Master Plan: (Informational)

Carolyn Chase provided an update regarding the City Council's

November 9 actions on the Complete Communities proposal and the Parks Master Plan proposal.

Began at 8:20pm

First the Housing & Mobility programs were passed 8-1 with Moreno voting no and expressing principled concerns about not making such significant changes during a lame duck session and in a pandemic. She also voted no on the Parks Plan mainly for this reason. In each case, she expressed support for various aspects of both Items, especially equity and the new fee systems. She requested the Parks Plan Item come back in January.

Significant changes were negotiated prior to the hearing including increasing Affordable Housing requirements to 40% and putting it on-site. The Building Industry Assn expressed concern that this was too high and would cause fewer projects to be built. Several other infill builders testified in favor. Tenant protections were also added and the opt-in Housing density increases would only apply to 20du/acre and multi-family zones. Lots could still be assembled to create larger projects. FARs were decreased from the prior proposal, citywide - now a max of 6.5 and in the Coastal Zone will be 2.5 for this opt-in program. 30-ft height limit still applies in the CZ. Public review would kick-in only for buildings over 95 ft. There is a lot of support/interest for monitoring for making adjustments over time and this will happen like they do updates to the Zoning Code.

As to the Parks Master Plan

Y'all were sent the hearing notes that had lots of details.

There were:

42 public speakers total

So basically 30 asking for change and 10 in favor

and with good representation from PB: Marcella Bothwell, Karin Zirk, Kristen Victor and myself each gave one minute of public testimony about the plan.

My main report tonight is about next steps related to the Parks Master Plan.

1. I've sent a list of follow-up questions to staff on issues that were raised in the hearing.

2. I'm staying active in the leadership with the coalition of groups including C3, Environmental Health Coalition, CPC and others and we will identify changes and create presentations.

3. Main points for changes (there are others):

- points system - related to devaluation of land vs infill projects (recreational amenities)
- commercialization
- MSCP (lands are for habitat and should not be considered for recreation)

these three were called out specifically as flaws by Council member Campbell

Overall the key concern is about the lack of requirement to add any new land to the system while significantly increasing density.

4. With respect to the DIF system vs the proposed Citywide Parks fee, the staff report includes estimates of \$1.2 billion of revenue for the new system vs \$1.11 billion in the old. I've requested the details about how these were arrived at, and including the timeframe.

The resolution that came with the PMP included the dollar amounts for the Citywide DIFs in many categories.

Overall, it would be a large increases for projects in PB going into the Citywide Parks Fund. Park Funds would be limited to park expenditures.

5. They added language "That at least 10 percent of the Citywide Park DIF will be prioritized for acquisition of new park land."

6. Personally I support passage of the PMP with changes and will remain active in helping define and create them. We may want to call another LUP subcommittee meeting

I'm happy to take any questions or email them. Thanks!

EG - what's the status of commercialization?

A - not really discussed; Our rep Council member Campbell mentioned it as one of the four main reasons she voted no and I believe one other - it would be in the notes I posted. It's on the list of questions I sent to staff as to how to proceed and what we want to improve.

Item 10 – 8:25 Government Representatives' Reports:

Since it's a holiday the reps are not available.

Item 11 – 8:45 Adjournment - Motion to adjourn EG/Jonathan C at 8:28pm Early!

Upcoming Meetings:

Streets & Sidewalks – Being rescheduled from November 25, 2020

Development Review – December 3, 2020

Full PBPG -- December 9, 2020

--

--

Board mailing list

Board@pbplanning.org

http://pbplanning.org/mailman/listinfo/board_pbplanning.org