

# 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 FEBRUARY 28, 2006

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Donna Nenow, Carmel Valley  
Jim Varnadore, City Heights  
Eleanor Mang, Clairemont Mesa  
Steve Laub, College Area  
Pat Shields, Greater Golden Hill  
Buzz Gibbs, Kearny Mesa  
Yvette Marcum, La Jolla (7:20)  
Ed Cramer, Linda Vista  
Jeff Stevens, Mira Mesa  
Tracy Reed, Miramar Ranch North  
Judy Elliott, Normal Heights  
Tom Gawronski, Ocean Beach

Mel Ingalls, Otay Mesa  
Kathy Mateer, Pacific Beach  
Cynthia Conger, Peninsula (7:25 p.m.)  
Joost Bende, Rancho Penasquitos  
Mike Freedman, San Ysidro  
Tamara Silverstein, Scripps Ranch  
Cindy Moore, Serra Mesa  
Guy Pruess, Skyline-Paradise Hills  
Reynaldo Pisano, Southeastern San Diego  
Eric Germain, Tierrasanta (7:05 p.m.)  
Dash Meeks, Torrey Hills  
Leo Wilson, Uptown

**VOTING ELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:** None.

**NON ELIGIBLE REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT:** None.

### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

**City Staff:** Jackie Dominguez, Betsy McCullough, Nancy Bragado, Jeff Strohminger, Cecilia Williams and Patsy Chow

**Guests:** Amy Benjamin, Program Analyst, SDHC and San Diego City Attorney Mike Aguirre

**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.*

- CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Steve Laub called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and proceeded with roll call.
- NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:** City Attorney Mike Aguirre expressed his support for the Planning Groups. Mr. Aguirre extended an offer to have either himself or other city attorney attend a community planning group meeting if ever required.
- MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA:** The Urban Design Element will be discussed before the Land Use and Community Planning Element.
- PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Betsy McCullough reported that she will be the Acting Planning Director until a new Planning Director is hired. Jeff Strohminger reported that the City Council adopted the Official Zoning map at today's Council meeting.



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

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** The Minutes of January 24, 2006 were approved as submitted.
6. **SAN DIEGO HOUSING COMMISSION ANNUAL ACTION PLAN: (Info Item)** Amy Benjamin, Program Analyst for the San Diego Housing Commission spoke briefly on the SDHC's Annual Action Plan. Ms. Benjamin was available for questions.
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. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT:** Cecilia Williams provided an overview of the Urban Design Element via a PowerPoint presentation.

Leo Wilson summarized the recommendations proposed by the CPC Subcommittee.

Mike Freedman moved to add the word "*creation*" to #5, in Section B, so that the sentence reads "...should contribute to the *creation* and the preservation of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place." The motion was seconded by Guy Preuss. The motion was approved 23-1-0.

Cynthia Conger moved to add to UD-A-11-E "*especially adjacent to community public viewsheds*". The motion was seconded by Leo Wilson. The motion was approved 22-1-1.

The CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Urban Design Element were approved as amended by the CPC, by a unanimous vote of 24-0-0.

**B. LAND USE AND COMMUNITY PLANNING ELEMENT:** Patsy Chow provided an overview of the Land Use and Community Planning Element via a PowerPoint presentation.

Leo Wilson summarized the recommendations proposed by the CPC Subcommittee.

Jeff Stevens moved to modify the sentence on Page 1, Plan Issues, fifth bullet point, to delete a portion of the sentence, including the added language suggested by the CPC Subcommittee, so that the sentence is shortened to: "Land use designations are not standardized throughout the City." The motion was seconded by Buzz Gibbs. The motion was approved 15-8-0.

Tracy Reed moved to delete the language proposed by the CPC Subcommittee on Item #8, Page 21. The motion was seconded by Leo Wilson. The motion failed 2-22-0.

Jim Varnadore expressed concerns over the CPC Subcommittee's failed, tie vote on Item #3, Page 5. Mr. Varnadore stated that adding the language "*should or should not*" allows individual communities to decide whether growth occurs. Mr. Varnadore moved to reinstate the motion to replace the word "should" with "*should or should not*." The motion was seconded by Eric Germain. The motion was approved 17-5-2.

Jim Varnadore expressed concerns over the CPC Subcommittee's failed, tie vote on Item #5, Page 8. Mr. Varnadore moved to reinstate the motion to add the sentence "*not every community will host a village.*" The motion was seconded by Eric Germain. The motion was approved 18-6-0.

Guy Preuss expressed concerns over loss of agricultural land. Mr. Preuss referenced the matrix on Page 4, Table LU-1, Existing and Planned Land Uses, which indicates existing acreage is 5,668 and planned usage is 3,670. Mr. Preuss moved that Table LU-1, Existing and Planned Land Uses, Agriculture, reflect no loss in acreage, i.e., existing acreage of 5,668 remains at 5,668 acres. The following discussion ensued:

Patsy Chow stated that adopted community plans land use designations are not being changed. Ms. Chow explained that *Planned Land Use* is based on what is designated in the adopted community plans and *Existing Land Use* is based on how the land is currently being used, which may be different than the planned designation. If the Planned Land Use designations are implemented, the numbers will change as indicated on Table LU-1.

Steve Laub suggested the table is misleading and implies a change in some of the land use designations.

Patsy Chow said staff is aware that the table is misleading and is working to correct it.

There was no second to Mr. Preuss' motion.

Guy Preuss moved to revise the matrix on Page 18, Table LU-3, Community Plan Land Use Designations, to reflect textbook definitions of residential density ranges as follows: *Very Low 0-1 du/ac, Low 2-4 du/ac, Medium 5-15 du/ac, High 15-60 du/ac, Very High 61+ du/ac.* The motion was seconded by Cynthia Conger. The motion failed 3-20-0.

Cynthia Conger moved to modify Page 8, LU-A.1, to add language to the end of the sentence "Affirm the position of Center City as the regional hub by maintaining and enhancing its role as a major business center in the region and encouraging its continued development as a major urban residential center with the largest concentration of high density multi-family housing in the region, *by requiring adequate public facilities to be built concurrently with the new development or redevelopment.*" There was no second to the motion.

Cynthia Conger moved to modify the language on Page 14, LU-B.2, to read "Achieve an overall mix of housing types to add diversity to neighborhoods and to *maintain and* increase housing supply." The motion was seconded by Kathy Mateer. The motion failed 8-12-2.

Cynthia Conger moved to modify Page 16, Goals, to add the language "*In built-out communities cumulative impact to be estimated at the beginning of each fiscal year.*" The motion was seconded by Judy Elliot. The motion failed 5-15-0.

Cynthia Conger moved to modify Page 17, to eliminate the mandate for increasing or maintaining overall density. The motion was seconded by Eric Germain. The motion failed 3-18-0.

Cynthia Conger moved to modify Page 37, LU-1.4, Public Facilities, to reinstate the language from the CPC Subcommittee's failed, tie vote, CPC Subcommittee Item #14, to add the clause: "*greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,*" to the text of the policy goal. The motion was seconded by Jim Varnadore. The motion was approved 12-8-0.

Judy Elliot moved that on Page 17, on the implementation of community based goals, an addition to the end of the sentence on overall density and housing capacity, that states "*but only when infrastructure deficits are eliminated and infrastructure occurs concurrent with further development.*" The motion was seconded by Leo Wilson. The motion was approved 19-2-0.

The CPC Subcommittee's recommendations on the Land Use and Community Planning Element were approved, as amended by the CPC, by a unanimous vote of 24-0-0.

#### **8. REPORTS TO CPC:**

- **Staff Report:** Betsy McCullough reported there will be a big COW at the end of April. The Administrative Guidelines are now online for community planning group member review.
- **Subcommittee Report:** Jim Varnadore stated that the News Rack Task Force is moving into its fifth year. The city attorney is still reviewing the draft ordinance.
- **Chair Report:** None.
- **CPC Member Comments:** None.

The next meeting will be held on March 28, 2006, 7:00 p.m., at the Metropolitan Operations Center II, Auditorium, 9192 Topaz Way, Kearny Mesa, California.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m. by Steve Laub.

jd

## URBAN DESIGN 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 Section A, “General Urban Design,” Policy UD-A.1 (a): The sentence “Protect the integrity of community open spaces **intended for preservation**,” was modified to read, “Protect the integrity of community open space.” (Vote: 4 – 1)

2.) Also in Section A: Policy UD-A.2: The word “*meadows*” was added to the sentence “Preserve and enhance naturally occurring features such as coastlines, rivers, *meadows*, creeks, canyons and ridge lines.” (Vote: 3 – 2)

3.) Also in Section A: Policy UD-A.13, (Signs): Where the text states: “Provide comprehensive project sign plans”; Subsection (a.) should be modified to read: “Design signs as a means to communicate a *unified* theme and identity *for a property*.”

4.) Also in Section A: Policy UD-A.16, (Safety and Security); Subsection (a) was modified to read: “Design projects *to encourage visible space that will serve as a means to discourage* and deter crime through the location of physical features, activities and people to maximize visibility.” These words replaced the phrase “**encourage natural surveillance**”, which was felt to be too intrusive. (Vote 3 – 2)

5.) In Section B, “Distinctive Neighborhoods and Residential Design:” The last sentence of the discussion (page 9) reads: “However, new development – whether it is in the form of infill, redevelopment, or first-time development – should contribute to *the preservation* of neighborhood character and creation of a sense of place.” The words “*the preservation*” replaced “**continuing positive evolution**.” (Vote: 4 – 1)

6.) In Section D, “Commercial Corridors:” Policy UD-D.2, (Mixed Use), the entire text of subsection (b) was deleted, which had stated: “**Encourage placement of active uses, such as retailers, restaurants, fitness centers, and various services, on the ground floor of buildings in areas where the greatest levels of pedestrian activity is sought.**” (Vote: 4 – 1)

7.) In Section G, “Public Art & Cultural Amenities:” Policy UD-G.1 (Community Identity), the following three words in *italics* were added to Subsection (d): “Reinforce community pride and identity by encouraging artworks and cultural activities that celebrate, *yet do not overwhelm*, the unique cultural, ethnic, historical, or other attributes of the neighborhood. (Vote: 3 – 2)

8.) Also in Section G: Policy UD-G.1, a new Subsection (g) was added which provides for the involvement and oversight by community planning committees in the decision-making process regarding public art and cultural amenities. (Vote: 5 – 0)

## LAND USE AND COMMUNITY PLANNING 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. Asterisks in front of numbered paragraphs refer to motions that failed on tie votes.)

1.) On Page 1, "Plan Issues," the fifth bullet point reads: "Land use designations are not standardized throughout the City in order to help implement General Plan goals and the City of Villages strategy." An additional sentence was added at the end which states: "*This variability helps communities preserve their unique character.*" (Vote: 4 – 2)

\*2.) On Page 2, 3, "Existing Conditions and Growth Projections" (Population Demographics): A motion deleting the entire last paragraph dealing with cultural diversity failed. The first sentence of the deleted paragraph reads: "*Cultural diversity is an important aspect of life throughout the region and the city. This diversity is reflected in...* (paragraph)" (Vote: 3 – 3; failed)

\*3.) On Page 5, "City of Village Strategy," in the Discussion paragraph, a motion failed to replace the word "should" with "should or should not" in the following sentence: "It is a strategy designed to allow each community to consciously determine where and how new growth **should** occur, and requires that new public facilities be in place as growth occurs." (Vote: 3 - 3: failed)

4.) On Page 6, "Village Categories" (Neighborhood Village Centers): The word "should" in the first sentence was changed to "*could.*" The sentence formerly read: "Neighborhood Village Centers **should** be located in almost every community plan area." (Vote: 4 – 2)

\*5.) On Page 8, "Village Locational Criteria," Policy LU-A.2 states: "Identify sites suitable for village-type development that will complement the existing community fabric or help achieve desired community character, with input from recognized community planning groups." A motion to add the following additional sentence failed: "*Not every community will host a village.*" (Vote: 3 – 3; failed)

6.) On Page 15, "General Plan Land Use Categories" (Industrial Employment): In Policy LU-B.8; the word "incompatible" was added, so the policy goal reads: "Protect key employment areas from encroachment from *incompatible* non-industrial uses while providing areas for secondary employment and supporting uses." (Vote: 6 – 0)

7.) On Page 16, "Common Planning" (Goals): Two words were added, so that the fourth bullet point reads: "Community plans that maintain or increase planned density of residential, *and employment*, land uses in appropriate locations." (Vote: 6 – 0)

8.) On Page 21, “Community Plan Land Use Designation” Table, under “Scientific Research” and “Light Industrial,” the office use allowed was expanded so that it was not limited to corporate headquarters, and would apply to all accessory office use. (Vote: 5 – 1)

9.) On Page 23, “Community Planning (Evaluating New Growth): In the first paragraph, second sentence, it states: “Historically, communities have not fully welcomed the idea of new growth when public facilities deficiencies exist.” An additional sentence was added: “*New development should not be allowed where existing public facilities are not sufficient to support it.*” (Vote: 4 – 2)

Note: This issue was discussed at length, with several different proposals for wording: The intent appears to be that new development does not occur until necessary infrastructure was in place.

10.) On Page 24, “Community Planning” (Community Facilities Prioritization): The words “*or applicable community plan*” were added to the sentence in the middle of the paragraph which states: “Individual new development proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, *or applicable community plans*, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (Vote: 5 – 1)

11.) On Page 25, “Community Planning” (Evaluating New Development): In Policy Goal LU-C.6, the words “and applicable community plan” were added, so that it reads: “Evaluate individual new development proposals to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely affect the General Plan, *and applicable community plan*, and to ensure that they do not compound existing public facility deficiencies.” (Vote: 6 – 0)

12.) On Page 27, “Plan Amendment Process” (Technical Amendment Initiation): Policy LU-D.7 was totally deleted, which formerly stated: “**Initiate a technical amendment without the need for a public Planning Commission hearing when the Planning Department determines, through a single discipline Preliminary Review, that the proposed amendment is necessary to ensure the public health, safety and welfare.**” (Vote: 4 – 2)

13.) On Page 34, “Airport Land Use Compatibility”: In Policy LU-G.1, the following clause was added to the end of the policy goal: “Work with the ALUC to develop policies that are consistent with the state and federal guidelines and that balance airport land use compatibility goals with other citywide and regional goals, **taking into account that public safety should be the most important consideration.**” (Vote: 5 – 1)

\*14.) On Page 37, “Environmental Justice (Public Facilities): For Policy LU-I.4, a motion failed which would have added the clause: “*greater resources should be provided to communities where greater need exists,*” to the text of the policy goal. It reads: “Prioritize and allocate citywide resources to provide public facilities and services to communities in need.” (Vote: 3 – 3; failed)

15.) Also on Page 37, in Policy LU-I.5, the word “(G)uarantee” at the beginning of the sentence was replaced with phrase “(S)trive to achieve.” The policy goal formerly read: “**Guarantee** meaningful participation for all community residents in the siting and design of public facilities.” (vote: 5 – 1)