

Clairemont Community Planning Group

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of
November 20, 2018
Alcott Elementary School Auditorium

P Naveen Waney - Chair P Nicholas Reed – Vice Chair P Margie Schmidt - Secretary P Delana Hardacre- Treasurer	P Harry Backer P Kevin Carpenter P Cecelia Frank P Chad Gardner	P Richard Jensen P Gary Christensen P Ryan Rolla P Jason Young	P Barbarah Torres P Matt Valenti P Susan Mournian L Billy Paul
--	--	---	---

P – Present A – Absent L-Late

Item 1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Naveen Waney called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.. Pledge of allegiance said. Moment of silence observed for recent tragedies. 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:

Mike Hunsiger: Expressed concerns re water supply from Colorado River and hydroelectric power.

Representative from Clairemont Cares: If wish to get on mailing list send info to SDClairemontCares@gmail.com

Committee Members:

Richard: Requests report from 2 groups meeting about Clean H2O project

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

None.

Item 4. Approval of Minutes Motion by Susan, second by Delana to approve minutes with minor correction.

VOTE: 14-0-1, Gary abstains d/t absence. **Motion Passes.**

Item 5. Council Representative Reports

District 2 Council Report, Marc Schaefer, Community Liaison, mpschaefer@sanidiego.gov Expressed gratitude on behalf of self and Councilmember Zapf. MTS will assess whether red curbs on abandoned bus line should be removed. Coastal Villas will be before City Council on 12/4.

Naveen & Eden Yaeger expressed thanks to Marc for all his work on behalf of the community.

District 6 Council Report, Councilmember Chris Cate, ccate@sanidiego.gov Budget for 2020 in planning, expect \$76million deficit. Each district to provide budget priority memo in January re ways to close budget gap. Expect an increased pension payment necessary. Will be investment in additional fire academies to staff new fire stations at Univ. City, UCSD, Black Mtn Ranch, Fairmount Ave & Paradise Hills.

Susan: When is Semper Building due to be completed? Resp: end of fiscal 2020

Margie: Is there a plan to readdress STVR issue? Resp: Unless an ordinance is substantially different cannot readdress for a year.

Public: Is Mt. Etna in upcoming budget? Resp: That is a county project.

Public: Question re gas tax? Resp: City does get an allocation (approx \$18million), will be incorporated into budget according to state requirements for this funding.

Item 6. Action Items

101. County of San Diego Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request for Former Crime Lab Site at 5255 Mt. Etna Dr. (Yara Fisher, AECOOM; Marc Cass, County of San Diego)

Gary recuses self from this Action Item.

Affordable housing has positive impacts on individuals & communities; demand high in SD but supply is low. 58% of renters in SD county pay more than 30% of income for housing. Taking steps to use County excess land to meet critical housing needs on 11 sites and has set up a \$25million trust fund to develop affordable housing. Former Crime Lab site is one of these 11 sites.

Asking Board to find that this project meets initiation criteria for a Community Plan Amendment (CPA). Action is not for approval of a specific development but that the project is consistent with the General Plan, Community Plan, availability of public facilities, and public benefits of the project beyond existing uses.

Site is approx. 4 acres, surrounded on 3 sides by commercial and backs up to SDGE easement. Previously was hospital, then Crime Lab, now vacant. Is in community core in Balboa/Genesee area, zoned for commercial office uses, allows affordable multi-family housing, in transit priority area.

CPA is a multi-year project. Have had five meetings with community since 8/24 initiation letter. Heard concerns about traffic, density, parking, availability of public services, compatibility of land uses. Anticipate being before Planning Commission (PC) on 12/6 for vote on Initiation Letter. If approved then begin CPA process. Expect to present an actual project to CCPG Board in summer, then City Council & County presentations in fall. Construction not until 2020. Goal is to change from commercial zoning to residential-high, allows 184-448 units with density bonus.

Consistent with General Plan: Was adopted in 2008, incorporates "City of Villages" concept, supports infill/mixed-use near transit, variety of housing types & affordability.

Consistent with Community Plan: Do need to amend but project is consistent with goals/objectives (maintains low density character of predominantly single family neighborhoods, uses multi-family areas as buffers between community core and single family areas, provides diversity of housing options, will include CPAZ-A design guidelines, located near commercial & transportation, adequate parking provided as lower-income/seniors/developmentally disabled use fewer cars, no loss of existing commercial uses, doesn't harm canyons.

Additional public benefits: Over 32,000 households in Clairemont have unmet needs d/t high cost of housing, growing senior population.

Public facilities: EIR will address this.

Marlon Pangilinan, senior planner, spoke regarding CPA process. PC will evaluate if this project is consistent with the criteria described above; if they approve "Initiation" it will only begin the analysis process. All expressed concerns by community will be evaluated during this analysis. Also an EIR will be developed assessing all potential impacts. A further recommendation will be necessary by the PC after the analysis to approve the amendment.

Naveen states CCPG is an advisory board making recommendations only.

Matt makes presentation regarding findings of Crime Lab Ad Hoc Sub-Committee. Looked at the 3 criteria described in policy LUD-10; proposal must be consistent with all 3. Sub-committee found that was not compliant with any of the 3 criteria; sub-committee voted to not recommend initiation request.

Board questions/comment:

Barb: What are Community Core Commercial Design Standards? Resp: In Comm Plan to ensure architectural themes are consistent and that pedestrian connections/street enhancements are included.

Jason: Commercial uses only in Community Core per Comm Plan, no residential uses? Resp: That is reason to request CPA. Municipal code allows for multi-family.

Delana: Not opposed to affordable housing, but quantity is concern. Seeking 448 units? Resp: Seeking Residential High zoning which would allow range of 184-448; no specific project numbers yet. Where get vehicle statistics, disagree that have fewer vehicles? Resp: Will provide research references.

Susan: Sorrento Towers is example of greater parking needs of seniors/disabled where overflow uses commercial spaces across street. States feels strongly that parking must be adequate.

Matt: Focuses on third criteria of public facilities available. Has County done this analysis? Resp: Will be addressed in EIR during amendment process. Matt notes feasibility study done by AECOM on 2 sites. Scores for downtown Family Court site for transportation/shopping/etc. are better than for Crime Lab site. Feels public facilities are insufficient for density/intensity planned on site. Also requesting all non-privileged communications regarding the CPA.

Margie: Feels site appropriate for multi-fam development, but area deficient in parks. Can SDGE easement be considered for a park? Also concerned that having single entry/exit for parking at this density is inappropriate. Resp: Are considering park space and ingress/egress concerns.

Harry: Desires firm density numbers. Supports sub-committee in depth assessment.

Billy: No comment.

Ryan: Parking concern; desires specific equation applied to calculation of needed spaces.

Cece: Affordable rates? Resp: Will be 100% affordable but don't have specific rates yet.

Richard: Site previously a hospital, "any new use should be community serving" per CP. Suggests that Kearny Mesa more appropriate location for this project; with anticipated budget deficit City will not be able to provide services. Resp: Any development fees are responsibility of developer. Multiple funding streams used for any affordable housing development to ensure that is sustainable and services provided. County is donating land.

Chad: There exists "push" to find housing, if say "no" to everything then decisions will be made without community. This is a good site for some development. Concerns about degree of development; desires specific definition of target population. Also re: area traffic & that one bus route runs q30min so not a TPA.

Kevin: Feels that this should be a specific project along with requested zoning change. Desire cap on size of bonuses. Should have a benefit to current community residents, full quota of parking, and limit to 15% affordable at 148 units.

Naveen: Understands that applicant wants to start process but feels that more project specifics needed prior to supporting. Resp: Every affordable development is specific to community/location/population.

Public comments/questions:

Veronica Stephanie (Clairemont Cares): Doesn't believe have "housing crisis", developers would not be able to pay in-lieu fees if crisis. Multiple affordable projects in area, i.e. the Stratton Apartments do not "add value". May result in "by-right" development which is appalling. Community does not support this amendment. Resp: Well documented affordable housing crisis, especially seniors and families.

Erin Cullen (Raise the Balloon): Why rush, why cannot incorporate into Community Plan Update (CPU) process. Support retaining 30' height limit. What stage are other projects at? Resp: This site and a 6th Ave. site are in process because were vacant. Expect all 11 to be developed in next 3-4 years.

Marlon Pangilinan: Not unusual to have CPA process begun while in CPU process, policy states can be done as long as is before Land Use & Transportation alternatives have been developed. Expecting that next spring.

Richard notes that the City has post-poned Land Use/Transportation topic at CPU repetitively despite sub-committee requests to address. Resp: Not intentional but d/t collaboration with consultants for a workshop.

Eden Yaege (CTC): Praises CCPG but opposes Action Item due to loss of voice if CPA initiated; advocates denial even though expects PC to override opposition.

Clairemont Coalition on Homelessness email read by Naveen: Urges approval and notes that questions/concerns will be assessed during process. Asserts that affordable housing is needed and applauds Council resolution to develop 140 permanent supportive housing units in every district. Suggest memorandum of understanding between Citizens Advisory Group and developer for cooperative progress on project.

Other community member comments:

Current zoning allows 119 afford units plus commercial on first floor which would provide jobs/services. CPU sub-committee has invested countless hours addressing this area, affordability, height limit, etc...should await CPU process completion. Concerns about fire safety. Historically CCPG, PC staff, & mayor denied a project in

2006 for adding residential above the International Market because was Community Core. Review should encompass entire Community Core not just 4 acre site. Living trends for developmentally disabled require full-time care givers so parking needs are high for this population. Amendment is regarding change from discretionary to administrative review and potential loss of community say. CP states maintain low-density of single family and that new development is compatible with adjacent uses and does not overburden resources. Permanent supportive housing (58 units) for seniors being developed just a block away. Maintain 30ft height limit. High density doesn't equate with affordable. Police is short on staffing; Stratton is freq policing problem. Holmes Elementary already at capacity. Question regarding analysis done by City anticipating change of zoning in CPU process. Some funding to be from bonds requiring tax-payer dollars. Encourage project within existing zoning. Requests to clarify affordable rates. Community frightened by scope of project because not shown a "working" model in other neighborhoods. Do want to help less fortunate but too many units proposed. Question number of affordable units planned for LJ, Pt Loma, or Rancho Santa Fe compared to Clairemont. When can no longer afford to live somewhere, individuals should move to where they can afford to live. Encourage attendance at 12/6 PC meeting on this item. Info sheet from Chelsea Development provides specifics re project: 404 units/465 pkg spaces, rent ranges posted. High density housing proposed at Balboa Station Area (>4000 units in 3.3 acre area), encourage attendance at next meeting. Change in zoning can only be done if existing zoning of less benefit.

Motion by Matt to change action item to a 4 component action item: making a finding regarding compliance with Policy LU-D.10 a) the amendment request appears to be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan and community plan and any community plan specific amendment criteria; making a finding regarding compliance with Policy LU-D.10 b) the proposed amendment provides additional public benefit to the community as compared to the existing land use designation, density/intensity range, plan policy or site design; making a finding regarding compliance with Policy LU-D.10 c) public facilities appear to be available to serve the proposed increase in density/intensity, or their provision will be addressed as a component of the amendment process; and making a recommendation regarding the Initiation Request. Second by Kevin. Matt notes that Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request must meet all 3 criteria of Policy LU-D.10 to move forward. Suggests that it is valuable for the decision makers to know the CCPG stand on compliance with each criteria as well as the recommendation on the Initiation Request. Thus this motion would allow a separate vote on each of the 4 components.

VOTE: 10-5-0, Motion passes.

Motion made by Jason to find that the Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request is **compliant** with Policy LU-D.10 (a). Second by Susan.

VOTE: 4-11-0, Motion fails.

Motion made by Jason to find that the Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request is **compliant** with Policy LU-D.10 (b). Second by Susan.

VOTE: 2-12-1, Abstention by Margie for inability to reach a decision. Motion fails.

Motion made by Jason to find that the Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request is **compliant** with Policy LU-D.10 (c). Second by Susan

VOTE: 3-12-0. Motion fails.

Motion made by Jason to approve the County of San Diego Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request for Former Crime Lab Site at 5255 Mt. Etna Dr. Second by Susan.

Further discussion included recognition that no motions have yet been passed and this motion should be worded in the negative in order for it to be passed and thus recorded and forwarded to Planning Commission.

Board comments as follows:

Barb-Community has reputation for rejecting projects. By approval would have studies done showing areas of needed services thus benefitting Clairemont. Does have concerns but feels will be addressed in process.

Jason-Good site for redevelopment, County process lacked cooperative approach on drastic change in zoning. Feels density proposed is not consistent with CP, benefits of affordable housing overshadowed by density, public facilities inadequate for project. Supports affordable housing but not 100% affordable which could result in socioeconomic segregation. All projects should be inclusionary.

Delana-Also supports affordable housing in Clairemont but not at this density.

Susan-Should let PC know what we want to see (i.e. traffic mitigation, improved schools/libraries/parks).

Regardless of who resides in a development at this site there will be an impact that needs to be prepared for.

Matt-Greatest concern is 3rd criteria because feels that there are inadequate public facilities.

Margie- Hold many concerns in common with community. Initiation Request doesn't confirm the CPA but begins evaluation and study of issues whether it is an appropriate change. Support increased aff. hsg.

Nick-Support aff. hsg. but concerns about police/fire/infrastructure. Would prefer to know developer.

Kevin-Is difficult because unable to say yes with qualifications. Would prefer that County take alternate approach in proposing this project.

Chad-We must be open to some development or community will be removed from the decision process. Fears losing voice on this project by support of Initiation Request d/t resulting expedition of process,.

Richard-Have voted that is not in compliance and have given reasons for same. Supports encouraging collaborative work between County, Board & community instead.

Ryan-If had followed own feasibility study would have proposed a mixed use project.

Billy-No motion has been passed yet. Need to make a motion in the negative that will pass, then forward to PC.

Harry-Concerns re density, impacts on infrastructure, lack of community benefit.

Naveen-Supports an alternate proposal that reduces density.

Jason withdraws existing motion.

Jason makes a motion to find that the County of San Diego Community Plan Amendment Initiation Request does not meet the criteria for compliance with the Community Plan Amendment Process and should be denied. Second by Susan.

Some discussion regarding potential amendments ensued. Susan called for the question.

VOTE: 14-1-0. Motion passes.

Ryan makes a motion to request County revisit the feasibility study and bring revised study back to the Board. Second by Richard.

VOTE: 4-11-0. Motion fails.

Kevin makes a motion to recommend that County pursue an alternate process that provides a specific project with details for review and consideration.

Second by Naveen.

VOTE: 15-0-0 Motion passes.

Richard suggests there be representation by the Board at PC meeting.

Item 7. Informational Items

None

Item 8. Workshop Items

None

Item 9. Potential Action Items

None

Item 10. Reports to Group: Most reports deferred d/t time constraints.

Chair Report – Naveen Waney – Balboa Station Specific Plan going before PC on 12/13. Sub-committee meeting on 11/29. For CCPG Board to provide recommendation to PC would need to hold a special meeting in early December. Following discussion was determined to provide the sub-committees recommendation to the PC and Balboa Station Specific Plan will be an action item at January Board meeting as we will be dark in Dec.

Vice-Chair/Parking & Transportation Report – Nicholas Reed – Elections coming in March.

Balboa Station – Harry Backer – Meeting on 11/29 6pm at Alcott.

Secretary/Morena Corridor Specific Plan Ad Hoc Sub Committee Report, Margie Schmidt – Deferred

MCAS Miramar – Cecelia Frank – Deferred

Treasurer – Delana Hardacre – Deferred

Community Plan Update – Susan Mournian – Deferred

Clairemont Town Council – Delana Hardacre – Deferred

Project Review Subcommittee – Kevin Carpenter – Deferred

By-Laws – Jason Young – Deferred

Adjournment at 9:02 PM

The next meeting will be held on January 15, 2019 6:00pm at Alcott Elementary School.