

Clairemont Community Planning Group

Minutes of the Meeting of
June 21th, 2016
Cadman Elementary School Auditorium

P Keith Hartz - Chair P Naveen Waney – Vice Chair P Nicholas Reed - Secretary P Delana Hardacre- Treasurer	A Harry Backer P Kevin Carpenter P Cecelia Frank P Chad Gardner	A Debra Howell P Richard Jensen P Michael Puente P Margie Schmidt	P Daniel Smiechowski A Lynn Titalii
---	--	--	--

P – Present A – Absent L-Late

Item 1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chair Keith Hartz. Roll call was taken and a quorum present.

Item 2. Non-Agenda Public Comment – Issues that are not on the agenda and are within the jurisdiction of the Clairemont Community Planning Group. **NOTE:** 2-minute time limit per speaker.

Public: Lucky Morrison – Lucky is intending on moving to Clairemont in the near future and wanted to give a brief introduction to the group. He is the former chairman of the North Park Maintenance Assessment District, and a 501c3 North Park/South Park Resident Association. He indicated he would have questions about zoning laws, and a community plan update.

Arianne Leigh – North Clairemont Librarian, talking about summer reading programs for children and adults.

Committee Members:

Margie Schmidt – Requested a moment of silence for the victims of the Orlando mass shooting.

Naveen Waney – Speaks about the upcoming Clairemont Summer Movie and Concert nights. At Madison High school

Nicholas Reed – Spoke in reference to Margie’s request for a moment of silence saying as the only LGBT member on the board, a word of thanks.

Delana Hardacre- Echoing a word of thanks to Councilmember Cate’s office on the Clairemont Senior Center funding.

Item 3. Modifications to the Agenda – Requires 2/3 approval.

Move Special Election results to after item 203. Keith makes motion, Naveen seconds. Passes 11-0-3.

Item 4. Approval of Minutes

Nicholas notes that the only change to the minutes that needs to be done is the header date at the bottom of the page states April 19th, 2016. This will be changed. Delana makes a motion to approve the minutes with the small correction, Nicholas seconds the motion. Passes 11-0-0.

Item 5. Council Representative Reports

District 2 Council Report, Adrian Sevilla, you can contact him at: adsevilla@sandiego.gov

James McGurik announces that this will be his last CCPG as a Community Liaison for Clairemont, and introduces Adrian Sevilla. Adrian speaks about the recent City Budget being passed by the City Council. Along with new community services. The Get-It-Done mobile app to report issues and problems to the City. A district

summer book drive is wrapping up. On June 25th and July 5th, there will be a beach clean-up for District 2 beaches. Delana Hardacre asks for a status update to a section of Moraga Ave. that was recently not repaved after a recent utility replacement project. James did state that the section she is talking about was not within the project scope. Delana asks if anything can be done, James states that Adrian will try and put in a request with the proper department.

District 6 Council Report, Allen Young, Community Liaison, you can contact him at: allen@sanidiego.gov.

Allen re-iterates about the full budget being passed by the City Council and the Get-It-Done app. He then speaks about the issues regarding broken delineators that are on Balboa Ave. in the eastbound lanes between Clairemont Dr. and Mt. Culebra Ave. Some of the delineators have been damaged during some recent traffic accidents. Some remedies mentioned to help slow drivers down and keep bike riders safe along this portion include, V-com speed signs, additional street lights to improve lighting, and a camera to monitor traffic flow. Public Speaker Billy Paul asks where exactly the V-com signs are to be installed. Allen replies that there is going to be one in each direction, in regards to exact locations, that is still to be determined. Kevin Carpenter asks is the camera a type of speed camera where tickets would be given for exceeding the speed limit. Allen replies that no, it is to monitor traffic flow and conditions only. Kevin also asks about a possibility of installing rumble strips into the pavement to help traffic slow down, Allen says that is indeed a possibility. Richard Jensen asks about installing sidewalks along this stretch of Balboa, Allen says that discussion on this can be had in sometime in the near-future. Billy Paul indicated per the Balboa Ave. Advisory Committee discussing this issue that a suggestion of placing a sidewalk on the south side of Balboa was made previously. Keith Hartz noted that the placement of these delineators provides a false sense of security for both bikers and drivers on this stretch of Balboa. And asked if there's a possibility to try and limit pedestrian access somehow, Allen did say that is also possible, and will be evaluated. Allen says the council office will defer any other issues to traffic engineers as they are more aware of the issues than the office. A gentlemen member of the public asks what side of the street could work better for pedestrian usage. Jason Young asks if the traffic dept. has given a budget number to put a sidewalk in at this location, perhaps before the next CIP comes in. Allen will return with those numbers sometime in the future. Susan Mournian asks if these delineators were put in as a part of a pilot program. Allen says, that this is not a pilot program, they are installed. Allen does also indicate that if changes are needed to the placement of these delineators, it will be made. Susan also asks if removal of these delineators is on the table. Allen says, that is probably not wise at this point in time. Another gentlemen member of the public asks when these delineators were installed. Allen did not have an actual date, but said within the last few weeks. Susan also asks how much these delineators cost. Allen did not have the figure available and will report back soon. Allen continues on to say that recently the basketball court and tennis court at North Clairemont Recreation Center were refinished.

Item 6. Action Items

101. Summit at Mission Bay Extension of Time Request – Dan Rehm

Dan makes a presentation indicating that the Prime Group, the current owner of what is currently known as the Coral Bay apartments is requesting an extension of all permits approved by the San Diego City Council back in 2009. This project was before CCPG first in Jan. 2008, with approval by the CCPG on Jan. 20th, 2009, then approval by the Planning Commission in April of 2009, then City Council in July of 2009. The proposal includes 499 units on 15 and ½ acres of property bordering between Iroquois Ave. to the south, Calle Neal to the north. Cowley Way to the east, and Clairemont Drive to the west. Dan indicates that they are looking for a simple request of extension, which is 5 to 7 years depending on the applicant. There are no immediate plans for construction at this time. Naveen Waney explains that this project was brought up to the Project Review Sub-Committee meeting on June 8th. The committee's recommendation was to deny the extension due to the amount of time that had elapsed between the project approval and now. Development Goals, and substantial deviations that were allowed in 2009 that now do not fit in with the community currently. Richard Jensen asks some questions about the span of time between the vote back in 2009 and today. Margie Schmidt asks what would happen if we deny the extension, Dan Rehm replies that it would be devastating for the project. Margie asks if this project can be reviewed once again. Naveen explains that we can choose to move forward on the extension with the concerns about the density, the height, parking concerns, major concerns about the set back issues with

the project. Naveen does understand the approvals in the past, and why are we questioning it now. It's because building codes and regulations change. The community atmosphere towards a project like this has changed too within the last 7 years. Naveen says to Margie that we can choose to take no action at the main board, and have them return to the PRS for a presentation. Chad Gardner agrees with Naveen saying we took into account the plans and deviations that were approved in 2009, but that they now require some reviewing under the current conditions. Several of the deviations could possibly be challenged or objected by community members. Dan Rehm went into detail on some of the parking changes for the project, along with stating that it will be a LEED Silver certified project, with it possibly being close to LEED Gold. 100% PV panels. Richard asks when the current extension expires, Dan replied saying it expires July 21st, 2016. Margie says that a possible resolution could be a no-action vote. Dan asks if a no-action vote is possible, Naveen says that it is. It would need to come to the PRS' July 13th meeting. Delana Hardacre agrees that this project should return to the PRS for review, then come back to the full Planning Group board. Margie makes a motion for the applicant to return to the PRS for re-review of the project. Daniel Smiechowski states that regardless of the meetings he attended and the community plan, he considers this over-development for the neighborhood. He continues on to state that are too many units, and the height of the project is too high for the neighborhood. And finally, area roads aren't equipped to handle the added amount of traffic that is coming with this project. Kevin Carpenter asks is there a procedural process for re-review of this project. Dan Rehm says that the conditions noted above could be added, and Naveen agrees. Chad suggests that while the traffic study the development paid for in 2009 is still good, a new one should be done. And goes on to say that this is a sensitive project for the community. Dan Rehm says that this too could also be looked at by the project. Michael Prinz says that an extension of time request that includes any dramatic changes to the project is not fully possible. Cary McCong says the project more or less comes down to 1.8 parking spots for each 3 bedroom condo, SDFD had requested that parking should be removed from the streets around the project. She also states notices from the city regarding this project were not posted on the property. However, they were previously posted. Billy Paul indicated that he was present at the original meetings back in 2009 when the project was reviewed, and recommends that the extension be denied. George Ammeralt is a resident at the project site, and says the noticing at the property was not done properly. He also says that he understands that CCPG and the San Diego City Council supported it back in 2009. He does not like the deviations from the project and understands that tonight's issue is to support or deny the extension. Carol Schleisman recommends to deny this extension due to the height issues, and increased traffic congestion. Donna Regalado wants to know what will happen to the current residents at the project site and their possible displacement. Keith Hartz asks Margie to reiterate her motion on the table, which is to send the project back to the PRS for review, then return to the planning group for a final say on the extension. Chad Gardner seconds Margie's motion. Daniel S. is asking why we are not denying the extension on the project. Chad replies saying that there is no harm in not denying it tonight, and it's to give an opportunity for the applicant's project to be reviewed once again. Naveen replies to Cary's comment that the noticing of the project is done by the City of San Diego and not the CCPG. Richard Jensen states that he is not in favor of this motion. Dan Rehm asks the whole planning group to seriously consider the motion on the table. Delana asks about the height restrictions, and Dan replies saying while they are 40 feet in the area, due to sloping of the land, it is more like 50 feet. Michael Puente asks what the difference is between giving a no-action vote and a vote to deny the extension. Margie also asks this question. Michael Prinz replies stating that Council Policy 600-24 says that action on this extension request needs to be taken, even if the applicant was not given a proper chance to speak. Chad asks why Dan Rehm got no notice that this extension was up for review at the PRS. Dan indicated he got no notice from the city. Naveen says he has received the packages showing the project, and has had contacts with the City Project Manager. He did indicate that he wanted to look at the project before approving or denying the extension. He also goes on to state that someone needed to look at the project after being on the table since 2009. Motion passes 9-2-0. With Daniel Smiechowski and Richard Jensen voting no.

Item 7. Informational Items

201. Clairemont Community Plan Update – Michael Prinz, Bryan Schoenfish, Brooke Peterson

Michael Prinz begins by stating what a community plan is. It is part of the City's General Plan, its community specific, acts as a plan for growth and development, and finally identifies vision and strategies to support community character. A community plan can last from 10 to 30 years. The last time the Clairemont Community Plan was updated was in 1989. The purposes for this update are, infrastructure financing, improve circulation and mobility. Also included are updates to Environmental review process. Key Community Plan elements are, Land Use, Conservation, Mobility, etc. Also with a new Climate Action Plan fronted by the city, a discussion on strategies will include on how to incorporate clean & renewable energy, energy & water efficient buildings, and adding more bicycling, walking, and transit options within the community. Brooke Peterson explains that this will be a 2-3 year process from June 2016 until sometime in 2018. Currently from June until September 2016, there will be an introduction of the update, with an existing conditions analysis. Phase 2 will involve said existing conditions, and community visioning. Phase 3 will talk about alternatives development for the community plan. The outreach strategy will include broad engagement of the community stakeholders and members. While at the same time making sure it is an open and transparent process with multiple ways to participate. And a final objective will involve soliciting input, ideas, and feedback to shape all phases of the planning process. A project website will be coming online in the next few months. Along with advisory committee meetings, email updates, stakeholder interviews. The role of CCPG in this update is to provide timely input and feedback to the staff, and serve as a representative of the boarder community. The next steps include an existing conditions analysis during the months of July and August that will include land use and urban design. Mobility, and the environment. And finally, what the current market conditions are like. An engagement roll out is planned for the September CCPG meeting, with the first workshop meeting to take place in October. Keith Hartz suggests that we as a board should consider a sub-committee or full board involvement for the Community Plan update. Margie Schmidt is pleased there will be some online presence for the community plan update, and will help the younger community understand the process. Also too have in-person meetings that appeal to older community members. Richard Jensen is also pleased that a plan is forthcoming, and hopes that the city not bring in an already made plan, and suggests the board to provide a great deal of input. Kevin Carpenter suggests that we make sure that urban design needs to be looked at by the community. With perhaps a case study being presented on what mixed use projects do, what happens if there is no growth, etc. Chad Gardner says this is a wonderful opportunity to shape Clairemont for the next 30 years. Continuing on to say that there is a constant struggle as to what smart growth looks like. Richard asks Michael if community plans are available for purchase, they are. Billy Paul says there are some areas of Clairemont that like to have their own identity that is separate from Clairemont as a whole. He also makes a suggestion that the word "Mesa" be removed from the community plan to give more inclusion. Billy continues on to speak about online vacation rentals (Airbnb) and how they should be incorporated into the plan. Lucky Morrison spoke about his involvement in the process for the North Park plan update over the last 4 years. And says that it's something not a committee can just do themselves, it has to be a large community affair. Donna Regalado asks what the planning group boundaries are, Michael shows her via a power point presentation slide. Carol Schleisman asks if this feedback from the Morena Blvd plan will be implemented. Michael says that is a plan indeed, but a goal is to gain involvement in the entire community. Susan Mournian asks about changes to heights, and the height overlay zone is community wide. Michael will not comment specifically, except to say that is part of the existing conditions analysis.

202. Sewer Rehabilitation Project AE-1 – Maryam Liaghat

The presenter speaks about the project stating, that every fiscal year, a certain amount of water/sewer lines needs to be replaced. This project includes 8.6 miles of 8in. and 10in. lines being replaced or rehabilitated. Additionally projects such as manhole rehabilitation, replacing manhole, fixing the tops of manholes, and rehabbing sewer cleanouts. This project includes a 371ft refurbishment of a sewer line on Stacey Ave, the method will be open-trench, going manhole to manhole putting material through the pipe. The project is at 100% design, construction will start in the winter of 2016, and will last about 330-340 days. The budget is about \$7million. 30 days prior to construction, budget notices will be sent out to residents via mail. 5 days prior to construction, door hangers will be places at each resident's house advising when the project will begin. There will be a resident engineer on-site during the entire project, with a phone hotline available for residents to call about the project. Delana asks if this entire project will be trench-less, yes it will be. Margie makes a comment

saying that the noticing of the project to the residents is properly done. Richard asks are the clean outs going between the street and sidewalk be dug up? Presenter says yes. The main lines take the quickest amount of time however. Kevin speaks about this type of project that was previously done in front of his house, and requests that the city give out better information to the residents. The workmanship was not great in regards to the project at his residence. Additional issues also included some worksite accidents, and to take into consideration of residence's front yards past the property line. Chad says that there is evidence of different contractors of past projects. The presenter explains that there are not many contractors doing these types of projects. And that the city has to go with whoever bids the lowest.

203. Special Election Results June 21st, 2016 – Naveen Waney

Naveen explains the reason for the special election to fill 2 vacancies on the board. 69 ballots were tabulated. There are 3 candidates. Susan Mournian and Billy Paul were elected to the board. Tonight starts the 24 hour period that the election can be challenged. If no challenges come forward after that time, the results will be certified by the chair and sent to the city. Naveen notes that if there are challenges, that he requests to be notified within that 24 hour period. Susan and Billy fill even year terms.

Item 8. Workshop Items

None

Item 9. Potential Action Items

None

Item 10. Reports to Group

Chairman Report/Community Planners, Keith Hartz: No Report.

By-Laws, Michael Puente: No report.

Planning Dept., Michael Prinz: Michael Prinz advised the group that the Balboa Station Plan website is online. And told the group that he will defer to Margie for a Morena Plan update.

Project Review, Naveen Waney: Naveen said, that the proposed Chik-Fil-A project on Balboa Ave. came to the meeting as an action item. Concerns regarding the project from sub-committee members included, pedestrian access issues, circulation issues, how this project fits in with the current Clairemont community plan and Balboa Ave. action plan. There were also some issues regarding industrial quality, and a lack of sustainability provisions given by the applicant. Additionally, no assessment letter was given by the applicant. Finally, there were some suggestions by members on how to make this project blend in more with the look and feel of the community. Next meeting, July 13th, 2016 at the North Clairemont Recreation Center.

Balboa Ave Station Plan Ad Hoc Sub Committee, Harry Backer: No report.

Morena Corridor Specific Plan Ad Hoc Sub Committee, Margie Schmidt: Margie indicated that draft design guidelines were discussed at the meeting. With an initial draft given, various feedback was provided to the city. The next meeting will be on June 18th at St. David's Episcopal Church at 6:00pm. The main agenda item will be Morena Blvd alternatives.

Treasurer, Delana Hardacre: \$229.61, no invoices.

Clairemont Town Council, Delana Hardacre: No report.

Parking/Transportation/Mobility, Nicholas Reed: No report.

Adjournment at 8:32 PM

The next meeting will be held on July 19th, 2016, 6:30pm at Cadman Elementary School.