

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego • 202 C Street, 5th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101

SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov • (619) 235-5200

CPC MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donna Nenow, Carmel Valley	Judy Elliott, Normal Heights
Paul Robinson, Centre City	Jeanne Ferrell, Old Town
Jim Varnadore, City Heights	Mel Ingalls, Otay Mesa
Eleanor Mang, Clairemont Mesa	Wayne Nelson, Otay Mesa/Nestor
Steve Laub, College Area	Cynthia Conger, Peninsula (7:42 p.m.)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area	James, Denton, Rancho Bernardo
Pat Shields, Greater Golden Hill	Joost Bende, Rancho Penasquitos
John Stewart McGaughy, Greater North Park	Mike Freedman, San Ysidro
Tom Hebrank, Kensington/Talmadge	Tamara Silverstein, Scripps Ranch
Buzz Gibbs, Kearny Mesa	Cindy Moore, Serra Mesa
Yvette Marcum, La Jolla	Guy Pruess, Skyline-Paradise Hills
Ed Cramer, Linda Vista	Reynaldo Pisano, Southeastern San Diego
Thomas Traver, Midway	Lee Campbell, Tierrasanta
Jeff Stevens, Mira Mesa	Dash Meeks, Torrey Hills (7:30 p.m.)
Tracy Reed, Miramar Ranch North	Faye Detsky-Weil, Torrey Pines
Karen Ruggels, Mission Valley	Linda Colley, University (8:20 p.m.)
Matthew Adams, Navajo	Leo Wilson, Uptown

VOTING ELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: Carmel Valley, Miramar Ranch North, Mission Valley and Old Town

NON ELIGIBLE REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT: Mike Taylor, Ocean Beach

OTHERS PRESENT:

City Staff: Jackie Dominguez, Mary Briner, Betsy McCullough, Nancy Bragado, Jeff Strohming, Tait Galloway, Marco Camacho, Randy Rodriguez and Deborah Sharpe

Guests: Barry J. Shultz, Chair of the San Diego Planning Commission

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

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Steve Laub called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and proceeded with roll call.
- 2. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:** John Pilch distributed copies of the Parking Advisory Board report and reported on some priorities outlined in the report for the CPC to take back to their planning groups. George Driver of Partners for Livable Places, discussed an upcoming symposium, information on which has already been sent out to all CPC representatives. Tom Mulaney of Friends of San Diego, discussed his concerns on the proposed downtown community plan.



This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in alternative format, or to request a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting, call 533-3650 at least five working days prior to the meeting to insure availability. Assistive Listening Devices (ALD'S) are available for the meeting upon request.

 Printed on recycled paper

3. **MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA:** None.
4. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Betsy McCullough reported that Gail Goldberg is leaving the City of San Diego at the end of the month to take a position with the City of Los Angeles. Jeff Strohming reported that staff recommendations on condominium conversions first phase were adopted at today's City Council meeting.
5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** The Minutes of November 22, 2005 were approved as submitted.
6. **CPG'S INTERACTION WITH PLANNING COMMISSION: (Discussion Item)** Barry J. Shultz, Chair of the San Diego Planning Commission introduced himself to the CPC. Mr. Shultz expressed desire to create a dialog between the CPC and the Planning Commission about major issues that affect us as we move forward. Mr. Shultz is interested in making arrangements to attend the CPC meetings on a more periodic basis. There was focused discussion on affordable housing.
7. **GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT REVIEW: (Action Item)** Nancy Bragado, Acting General Plan Program Manager continues to work with the CPC Subcommittee on the General Plan Update to prepare motions for the full CPC consideration.

A. NOISE ELEMENT: Tait Galloway presented an overview of the Noise Element via a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations, which were mostly minor and technical. The CPC Subcommittee recommended that the guidelines for noise compatibility and land uses be brought back to the full CPC for discussion.

Mike Freedman moved to accept the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Noise Element, as submitted. The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued.

Mike Freedman proposed an amendment to the main motion, to accept the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations, with Item #2 removed and referred back to the CPC Subcommittee for further review and Items #6 and 7 to be replaced with the amended language as per the document distributed by Buzz Gibbs, under D, Aircraft Noise. The motion was seconded by Leo Wilson. The motion was approved 27-0-1

Lee Campbell moved to amend the original motion to include in Section D, a statement that says providing the separation of residential and airport land uses so that sensitive noise receptors are not in close proximity. There was no second to the motion.

Jim Varnador moved to call the question on the main motion. The motion was seconded and passed with 2/3 vote.

The main motion was approved as amended 28-1-0.

B. CONSERVATION ELEMENT: Randy Rodriguez presented the Conservation Element to the CPC Subcommittee in December 2005. Other than some minor

technical revisions, the CPC Subcommittee supported the directions, goals and policies presented.

It was moved and seconded to accept the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Conservation Element. Discussion ensued.

Cynthia Conger moved to amend CE-A.1, C, to add language after the words designated in community plans, "by dedicating them as long-term open space use, etc." The motion was seconded by Laura Riebau. The motion to amend failed 11-16-1.

It was moved, seconded and passed by 2/3 vote to close discussion and vote on the original motion.

The motion to accept the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Conservation Element was approved 20-8-0.

- C. RECREATION ELEMENT:** Randy Rodriguez stated that the Recreation Element was submitted to the CPC Subcommittee in January. The CPC Subcommittee had some minor technical edits to public access and recreational opportunities, preservation, accessibility. The Subcommittee was in general agreement with the directions, goals and policies presented.

It was moved and seconded to accept the CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Recreation Element. Discussion ensued.

Jeff Stevens moved to amend the main motion to delete the sentence "The policy should be stated in general and non-specific terms, and not list specific acreage." Also, in regards to the statement "Some communities may need a higher ratio of acres to gain equivalency for the benefits conferred", the acreage given should be a minimum. The motion to amend was seconded and approved 19-3-0.

It was moved, seconded and passed by 2/3 vote to call the question on the main motion as amended.

The main motion was approved as amended 17-5-0.

Discussion ensued on population-based park standards. Staff provided information/data on how the City is getting less than the 2.8 gross acres per 1,000 residents guidelines being implemented by the City. The CPC agreed with the notion of specifying "net usable" but not lowering the standard if the City is currently getting less than what it expects.

Dash Meeks moved that the current proposed standard of 2.4 of usable acres per 1,000 residents be changed to 2.8 usable acres per 1,000 residents. The motion was seconded by Laura Riebau. The motion was approved 14-8-0.

D. PUBLIC FACILITIES, SERVICES AND SAFETY ELEMENT: The Chair deferred this item until the next meeting.

8. REPORTS TO CPC:

- **Staff Report:** Betsy McCullough reported on continued staff reductions which has caused some staff reassignment and reorganization. The training schedule for the 2006 COW's is coming out soon. The bylaws shell will also be ready soon.
- **Subcommittee Report:** Buzz Gibbs said the Public Working Group met on the airport issues. Mr. Gibbs gave the breakdown of the cost estimates on the Campo and desert airport sites.
- **Chair Report:** The Chair discussed a letter CPC representative received from City Attorney Mike Aguirre, regarding updating the community plans. Mr. Laub was told that several community groups had inquired with the city attorney about this topic. The letter was sent as a confirmation that the process does need to occur. Mr. Laub stated that several communities that have Business Improvement Districts (BID) have received applications for a site development permit, for a public right of way enhancement program. Mr. Laub inquired if the committee wanted to take this issue up at a CPC review level. By general consent, the committee decided the issue should be taken up on a community by community basis.
- **CPC Member Comments:** Laura Riebau suggested the Chair of the each CPG receive information via email in order to expedite discussion of issues.

The next meeting will be held February 28, 2006, 7:00 p.m. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. by Steve Laub.

jd

NOISE ELEMENT

CPC General Plan Review Subcommittee Proposed Revisions

(Note: Words or sections to be replaced are typed in **bold**; the replacement language is printed in *italics*. The vote is only indicated if it was not unanimous.)

1.) In Subsection A, “Noise and Land Use Compatibility,” The first sentence states: “The Noise Element is related to the Land Use Element because excessive noise affects **residential land uses**.”

The words “residential land uses” should be changed to “*all land uses*.”

2.) Also in Subsection A: Figure NE-2: “Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use,” indicates the community noise exposure levels.

The basis of the Guidelines needs to be clarified at the full CPC meeting; by a tie vote of 3-3, the Subcommittee voted against rejecting the guidelines in favor of a more restrictive interpretation. The intent was to revisit the issue at the full CPC meeting;

3.) In Subsection B, “Motor Vehicle Traffic Noise,” Policy NE-B.1 reads: “Encourage noise compatible land uses adjoining existing and future highways and freeways.”

After the words “compatible land uses”, the phrase “*and site planning*” should be added;

4.) Also in Subsection B: Policy NE-B.2 reads: Require traffic calming and traffic control measures that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise in noise sensitive land use areas.”

At the end of the sentence, the clause should be added: “*with due consideration of the traffic impacts that would be created*.”

5.) In Subsection C, “Trolley and Train Noise,” Policy NE-C.1 reads: “Encourage noise-compatible land uses near the rail corridors and trolley lines.”

After the words “noise-compatible land uses” the phrase “*and site planning*” should be added;

6.) In Subsection D, “Aircraft Noise,” the first paragraph reads: “Aircraft noise affects communities that are adjacent to an airport during takeoffs, approaches and landings. Aircraft noise varies in how it affects land uses depending upon the type and size of the aircraft and the height of the aircraft along the flight path. Another variable affecting the overall impact of noise is a perceived sensibility to aircraft noise at night.”

The following paragraph will be substituted: “*Aircraft noise impacts communities that are adjacent to or in close proximity to an airport. The noise impact or the perceived annoyance*”

depends upon the noise volume, length of the noise event and the time of day. In general, aircraft noise varies with the type and size of the aircraft, the power the aircraft is using and the altitude or distance of the aircraft from the receptor. Another variable affecting the overall impact of noise is a perceived increase in the annoyance of aircraft noise at night."

7.) Also in Subsection D, the first sentence of paragraph five reads: "Noise from **commercial** aircraft primarily affects communities that are adjacent to Lindbergh Field during takeoffs, approaches and landings."

Delete the word "commercial."

8.) In Subsection F, "Industrial Activity Noise," Policy NE-F.2 reads: "Limit outdoor industrial activities or operations to minimize excessive noise." And Policy NE-F.3 reads: "Limit the hours of operation of high-noise generating industrial equipment.

At the end of both Policy sentences, the additional clause should be added: "*where possible if sensitive noise impacts are created*";

9.) Also in Subsection F, a new policy number should be added at the top of the list which states: "*Provide for separation of residential and industrial uses, so that sensitive noise receptors are not in close proximity, or are buffered and insulated*";

10.) In Subsection G, "Construction/Refuse Vehicles and Parking Lot Sweeper Noise," Policy NE-G.2 reads: "**Continue to** enforce the City of San Diego Municipal Code restricting the hours of operation for construction activity."

The words "Continue to" should be deleted, and the sentence should begin with the word "*Enforce.*"

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

CPC General Plan Review Subcommittee

Proposed Revisions

(Note: Words or sections to be replaced are typed in **bold**; the replacement language is printed in *italics*. The vote is only indicated if it was not unanimous.)

1.) In Subsection A, "Open Space and Landform Preservation," the discussion section should provide an explanation of the differences, and definitions of, both public and private open space;

2.) Also in Subsection A: Policy CE-A.3 reads: "Balance the city's housing goals and conservation goals, through the City of Villages strategy of targeting mixed-use development into the existing **commercial** fabric of the city."

This language should be revised to speak more broadly; the word "commercial" should be replaced with "*urban*," protection of vacant and open land should receive emphasis;

3.) In Subsection B, "Water Supply," Policy CE-B.1 (b) reads: "Develop potential groundwater resources and storage capacity, combined with management of surface water in the water basis to meet overall water supply and resource management objectives." (4 – 1 vote)

After the first three words "potential groundwater resources," the following clause should be added: "*with consideration for capacity and recharge.*"

4.) In Subsection E, "Biological Diversity," Policy CE-E.2 reads: "**Implement the City of Villages strategy as a means to meet the city's substantial housing needs, while reducing pressure to develop open space.**"

The entire policy should be deleted. This issue should be discussed in the Housing Element:

5.) Also in Subsection E, Policy CE-E.5 reads: "**Consider** important ecological resources when determining where to apply floodplain regulations and development guidelines."

The word "consider" should be replaced with "*protect.*"

6.) In Subsection H, "Sustainable Development and Urban Forestry," Policy CE-H.7 (d) reads: "Increase use of trees which lose their leaves at the end of the growing season and native vegetation."

This policy should be edited to further explain the significance of trees that lose their leaves;

7.) Also in Subsection H, Policy CE-H.8 reads: "Develop measures to limit or mitigate the use of dark materials on roofs and roads."

Additional language should be added to exempt solar devices;

8.) Also in Subsection H, in Policy CE-H.9: "Urban Forestry," a new subpart "g." should be added which places emphasis on water conservation in urban forestry, and the planting of drought resistant trees;

9.) In Subsection L, "Historic and Cultural Resources," Policy CE-L.1 (c) reads: "**Encourage** the consideration of historic and cultural resources early in the development review process."

The word "encourage" should be replaced with "*require.*" (3-2 Vote)

10.) Also in Subsection L, Policy CE-L.1: "a new subpart "h." should be added which states: "*In conformance with applicable community plans, encourage the creation of historic and conservation districts.*"

11.) Also in Subsection L, Policy CE-L.5 (Public Education) reads: "**Encourage** public attendance at monthly Historic Resources Board meetings."

The word "encourage" should be replaced with "*Create a policy to encourage.*"

RECREATION ELEMENT

Community Chair Subcommittee: General Plan Update Proposed Revisions

(Note: Words or sections to be replaced are typed in **bold**; the replacement language is printed in *italics*. The vote is only indicated if it was not unanimous.)

(Note: The following recommendations are in response to the revised draft of the Recreation Element, which was presented to the Subcommittee in January 2006.)

In the Introduction, the challenge of obtaining additional park land in a city that is substantially developed should be discussed;

NOTE: Language that dealt with childhood obesity and other health issues has been deleted from main text of revised draft;

2.) In Subsection D, "Joint Use and Cooperative Partnerships," Policy RE-D.6 reads:

"Right-of-Ways: Establish a policy to address underutilized or unnecessary right-of-ways."

- a. Direct that an inventory of those right-of-ways be maintained.
- b. Develop criteria to determine potential value for bike, pedestrian, and equestrian linkages; and for trail access to open space canyons."

Add a subpart (c) which states: "*Unused city land, including paper street right-of-ways, should be considered for use for park and open space purposes*";

3.) Also in Subsection D, Policy RE-D.10 reads:

"Develop joint use agreements with school districts to help implement population based park needs (see Table RE-3).

- a. Provide an acre for each acre, up to five acres, that a school provides for a neighborhood park.
- b. Provide an acre credit for each acre, up to seven acres, that a school provides for a community park."

The policy should be stated in general and non-specific terms, and not list specific acreage. Some communities may need a higher ratio of acres to gain equivalency for the benefits conferred;

4.) In Subsection E, Policy RE-E.2 (e) reads: "Preserve **designated**, public open space corridors, such as views to Pacific Ocean, other bodies of water and significant topographic features."

The word "designated" should be deleted, and the language expanded to encompass

any view corridors identified in a community or park plan;

5.) Also in Subsection E, Policy RE-E.3 reads: "Acquire remaining private beaches in the **La Jolla Community** for public uses."

The text should be revised to read: "*Where, feasible, acquire remaining private beaches for public uses.*" The General Plan should not reference a policy goal to a single community;

6.) In Subsection F, "Park and Recreation Guidelines," Policy RE-F.16 reads: "Pursue joint-use agreements and facilities as a means of meeting Park and Recreation Guidelines."

A clause should be added to the end of this policy, limiting its application to situations "*where such Guidelines cannot be met through outright purchase or use of public land.*" The issue of enhancements and credits will be present to the full CPC;