

# Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego  
9485 Aero Drive • San Diego, CA 92123  
SDPlanninggroups@sandiego.gov • (619) 235-5200

## **CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF OCTOBER 22, 2019**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Barry Schultz, Carmel Valley (CV)	Andrea Schlageter, Ocean Beach (OB)
Karina Velasquez, Chollas Valley (CHV)	Mark Freed, Otay Mesa (OM)
Russ Connelly, City Heights (CH)	Jason Legros, Pacific Beach (PB)
Naveen Waney Clairemont (CLMT)	Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Jose Reynoso, College Area (COL)	Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos (RP)
Linda Godoy, Eastern Area (EAS)	Marc Lindshield, San Pasqual/Lake Hodges
Kathy Vandenheuvel, Greater Golden Hill (GH)	Wally Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch (SR)
David Gordon, La Jolla (LJ)	Bryce Niceswanger, Serra Mesa (SM)
Howard Wayne, Linda Vista (LV)	Guy Preuss, Skyline/Paradise Hills (SPH)
Dike Anyiwo, Midway (MW)	Myron Taylor, Southeastern (SE)
Jeff Stevens, Mira Mesa (MM)	Mike Ogilvie, Tierrasanta (TIRSN)
Debbie Watkins, Mission Beach (MB)	Brad Remy, Torrey Pines (TP)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)	Chris Nielsen, University (UN)
Rene Vidales, North Park (NP)	

**VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:** Barrio Logan, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Del Mar Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Otay Mesa Nestor, San Ysidro, Torrey Hills, Uptown.

**Guests:** Barrett Tetlow, Vicki Estrada, Jonathan Avila, Maya Rosa, Nicholas Reed, Sandy Wetzel-Smith, Peter Hill, Emir Williams, Becky Rapp, Sean Torres, Randy Steffler, Sumer Hasenin, Russ Gibbon, Rammy Cortez, Marco Polo Cortes, William Penn.

**City Staff/Representatives:** Laura Black, Brian Schoenfisch, Renee Mezo, Marlon Pangilinan, Lisa Lind

**NOTE:** *The sign-in sheets 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 Wally Wulfeck called the meeting to order at 6:25 pm.

### **2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:** 2 minutes per issue.

Jeff Stevens spoke about the Mira Mesa Community Plan Update grant funding scope. Vicki Estrada of Estrada Land Planning, member of ASLA and co-chair of upcoming conference on landscape architecture, invited members to the Conference on Landscape Architecture to be held in San Diego on November 18th. More information is available at [aslaconference.com](http://aslaconference.com).

### **3. MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Chair Wulfeck announced the staff report would be presented before action items.

**4. Staff report**

Laura Black, Deputy Director, made an announcement that the Silver Room will not be available for the November meeting. The November CPC meetings will be held at the Planning Department offices at 9485 Aero Drive. The 2020 meeting location will be announced.

**5. ROLL CALL AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 27, 2019:**

Chair Wulfeck took roll at 6:40 pm and proceeded to approve the minutes with Ayes: CV, CH, CLMT, GH, MV, MM, NP, OM, PB, RB, RP, SE, SPH, SR, SM, & UN. Nays: None, Abstain: COL, EA, LV, TIRSN. Motion passed 16-0-4.

**6. 12th UPDATE TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, PHASE II – Action Item**

Rene Mezo, Development Project Manager at the City of San Diego Planning Department, presented on the second phase of the 12<sup>th</sup> code update to the Municipal Code. The first phase involved 56 items that were adopted on July 23, 2019. The second phase involves 41 items to address changing land use issues, improve housing affordability, streamlines the review process, and clarify regulations. A matrix was provided that summarizes the items including but not limited to continuing care facilities and child care, floodplain regulations, landscaping, and minor corrections. The draft language was made available to the Chair on October 2, 2019. The items have been to the Code Monitoring Team for a recommendation and will go to Planning Commission on October 24, 2019. Comments from tonight's discussion will be a part of the discussion moving forward.

**Board Comment:**

Members requested clarification or further explanation on several items as well as the timing of Phase II of the 12<sup>th</sup> update. Several members indicated that their Community Planning Groups have not discussed the proposed items and will put the item on their next agenda. Staff provided additional information on the proposed changes for limited use for continuing care facilities, and staff explained the proposed item also removes density limitations for those uses. Mark Freed indicated that item #16 for vehicle storage as primary use is supported in Otay Mesa. Two items related to the separation requirement and measurements for cannabis facilities and the addition of local regulations for separation requirements for related billboard advertisements were explained by staff. Several members expressed concern about the changes that involve a path of travel as a measurement as it may bring cannabis facilities closer to sensitive uses. Staff also provided clarification on the parking requirements for assembly uses, certification process for environmental documents, and the proposed changes for the Environmentally Sensitive Lands regulations.

**Public Comment:**

William Penn expressed concern over the time to review and meeting agenda and workshops associated with discussion of the 12<sup>th</sup> code update, and the specific proposed changes related to cannabis facilities. Becky Rapp also spoke about concerns about the changes related to the items addressing marijuana production facilities. Speaker (name not on sign in sheet) spoke about not supporting some of the specific changes related to separation requirements for cannabis facilities. Kathleen Lippett reiterated the concerns expressed by other speakers about the process for the changes related to cannabis facilities.

Motion offered by S/PH that in that the 12<sup>th</sup> update was fast-tracked by the mayor without sufficient time to be evaluated by the Community Planning Committee nor by the Code Monitoring Team, this item is recommended for postponement until the January meeting and Planning Commission and City Council covering this item until after January. Seconded by MB.

Ayes: CV, CH, CHV, CLMT, COL, EA, GH, LJ, LV, MB, MV, MW, MM, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SE, SPH, SPLH, SR, SM, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: None. Motion passed 27-0-0.

**7. COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP REFORM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS ON REVISIONS TO COUNCIL POLICY 600-24 – Action Item**

Chair Wulfeck introduced the item indicating that there were several items that could be dispensed with given their acknowledgement and acceptance by the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office and that the other remaining items would be discussed at CPC with a final vote in November to allow time for each respective Community Planning Group (CPG) to provide input on the Task Force recommendations.

Barrett Tetlow, Chief of Staff to Councilmember Scott Sherman's Office, reported that there were three different reports concerning CPGs over the last year and half which provided recommendations to strengthen and improve them. He mentioned that in April, the Land Use & Housing Committee (LUHC) voted to create a taskforce/working group to consolidate all recommendations and modifications to Council Policy 600-24 into one report, consult with CPC and other community groups, report back and provide recommendations to the LUHC, and go before the City Council prior to the end of the year. Tetlow indicated that there were 31 different recommendations for the CPC to consider and suggested options on the how the CPC should review them.

Chair Wulfeck, in the interest of time offered the following recommendations stating that they have since been acknowledged and accepted by the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office: #1, #2, #4, #5, #8, #15, #18, #19, #22, #23, #24, #25, #26, #28, and #31.

**Board Comment:**

Members posed questions on how the Task Force Report was developed, emphasized that recommendations were requiring more duties of volunteers, and expressed a desire to review recommendations in detail and in order from Chair Wulfeck's list first.

*Recommendation #1 – Ensuring that Community Planning Group (CPG) rosters, annual reports, and meeting minutes contain all the required elements as described in Council Policy 600-24 through proactive monitoring of those documents*

**Board Comment:**

Members raised questions as to who would be doing the "proactive monitoring" and that the forms utilized by the CPGs should be standardized to allow broader use and efficient gathering of data.

*Recommendation #2 – Establishing a 72-hour due date for receipt of CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Services Department Project Managers.*

**Board Comment:**

Members commented that 72 hours to provide recommendations to DSD was too short and that it should be extended to 7 calendar days. Other members indicated that extending the reporting period beyond 72 hours would hurt project timelines.

**Public Comment:**

Members of the public expressed that anecdotal information should not drive policy, and that the CPC should look at data on whether a lack of CPG action has delayed any projects. Other

comments expressed that 72 hours was a sufficient amount of time, but that extending 4-5 days wouldn't be detrimental to the process.

*Recommendation #4 – identifying deadlines for CPGs to provide the Planning Department with rosters, minutes, and annual reports, so that the Planning Department can post them online to ensure this information is available to the public in a centralized location.*

Board Comment: None

*Recommendation #5 – Including elections results in the record retention requirements.*

Board Comment:

Board members expressed a need for clarification on how long elections results are kept despite online posting of the results and whether it would still be necessary to retain the information after the deadline for contesting the election has passed.

*Recommendation #6 – Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements, and submitted to the City Clerk.*

Board Comment:

Chair Wulfeck indicated that this recommendation has to go to the City Attorney's Office for review. No other Board comments.

*Recommendation #8 – The Planning Department should coordinate with the Development Services Department to communicate a consistent message to project applicants of the role of CPGs in the project review process.*

Board Comment: None.

Motion: Chair Wulfeck offers a motion to accept recommendations #1, #2, #4, #5, #8 with modification to Recommendation #2 to establish a seven-calendar day due date for receipt of CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Service Department Project Managers. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, LJ, LV, MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: GH & OM. Motion passed 25-2-0.

*Recommendation #15 – Define CPG resident representation as renters or homeowners.*

Board Comment:

Concerns raised as to whether differentiating between renters and homeowners could be discriminatory. Others indicated that this would be a way of preventing discrimination by identifying renters to accurately determine representation. Another concern was raised that renters, especially those in City Heights may feel uncomfortable documenting more information in public, so using the category "resident" should cover everything. It was also expressed that the categories in Council Policy 600-24 are clear and should be used and that all members on a CPG should speak with one voice regardless of classification.

Public Comment:

It was mentioned that the whole point behind creating another classification was in response to a sense of discrimination against renters, so the need was to be more inclusive especially when renters are the majority and therefore should be equally invited to participate. Other comments

expressed the need to make it known that renters are allowed and that they do provide good insight from other cities.

*Recommendation #18 – The City shall develop and implement a robust outreach plan to publicize CPG elections.*

Board Comment: None.

Motion: Motion offered by UN to Accept Recommendation #15 as it was written. Seconded by CLMT. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, COL, MW, MM, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SR, SM, TP & UN. Nays: CH, EA, GH, LJ, LV, MB, MV, SPH, SE & TIRSN. Motion passed 17-10-0.

Motion: Motion offered by LJ to Accept Recommendation #18. Seconded by MV. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, GH, LJ, LV, MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: None. Motion passed unanimously 27-0-0.

*Recommendation #19 – Community Planning Groups that are unable to meet CP 600-24 quorum and attendance requirements should be considered for disbandment or consolidation with a neighborhood CPG.*

Board Comment:

Board members raised a need to clarify the timeframe or provide guidelines on how long a CPG can operate before they are disbanded and how CPGs can be re-established after they are disbanded.

Motion: Motion offered by LV to disapprove Recommendation #19. Seconded by SPH. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, GH, LJ, LV, MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: None. Motion passed unanimously 27-0-0.

*Recommendation #22 – The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership.*

Board Comment:

A comment was made to clarify what the City means by “diversity.”

Motion: Motion offered by NP to clarify what “diversity” means in Recommendation #22. Seconded by CH. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, GH, LJ, LV, MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: None. Motion passed unanimously 27-0-0.

*Recommendation #24 – Provide required ongoing education for decision-making processes and planning.*

*Recommendation #25 – Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members.*

*Recommendation #26 – The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City Departments, should provide a comprehensive training program.*

Board Comment:

Comments from the Board involved whether every other year or annually is appropriate for ongoing education, a need to clarify who is providing education, making training voluntary for

CPG members, but mandatory for the Planning Department to provide ongoing education, and that online training is fine with no specific time for completion.

**Public Comment:**

It was expressed from the public that online training should be emphasized, but that there should be in-person training for those who don't use computers.

**Motion:** Motion offered by MB to approve all the requirements of training, striking out the word "annually" in the first line of Recommendation #25 and "mandatory" in 26.1 of Recommendation #26 and adding a 26.3 to Recommendation #26 stating that all training should be offered online and in-person and for Recommendation #24 add for clarification that the Planning Department will provide the ongoing training. Seconded by CH. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, GH, LJ, LV, MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN. Nays: None. Motion passed unanimously 27-0-0.

**Board Comment:**

A comment was raised from one of the Board members to review Recommendations #28 and #31. Chair Wulfeck made a request to extend the meeting to deal with Recommendations #28 and #31. No opposition was given.

**Public Comment:**

A question was asked whether there would be public comment in general regarding Agenda Item #6, to which the Chair clarified that there would be and that the more controversial recommendations would be discussed at the next meeting.

*Recommendation #28 – Direct the San Diego City Planning Department staff to closely monitor CPG actions and provide timely guidance to preclude request for inappropriate project additions or modifications.*

**Board Comment:**

It was noted that the numbering of recommendations on page 9 of the report are listed in error as there are two recommendations listed as "#28". Chair Wulfeck suggested that the item be postpone given the complexity of issues involved.

*Recommendation #31 – The Planning Department, in conjunction with the Development Services Department, should improve its documentation of CPG recommendations and post all CPG documents, including project review recommendations on the City website.*

**Board Comment:**

Chair Wulfeck indicated that staff already does this by providing the recommendations from the CPG in the staff reports which are posted online. Others indicated that it is difficult to read plans online and that hardcopies should also be available.

**Public Comment:**

Comments from the public emphasized making it easier to find project information online and that applicant plans should be on the website so people can decide to go to a meeting or not.

**Motion:** Motion offered by CLMT to approve Recommendation #31 as written with the inclusion of better wayfinding of information on the City's homepage to make it easier for people to find the information easily. Seconded by CV. Ayes: CV, CHV, CLMT, CH, COL, EAS, GH, LJ, LV,

MW, MM, MB, MV, NP, OB, OM, PB, RB, RP, SPLH, SPH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP & UN.  
Nays: None. Motion passed unanimously 27-0-0.

**Public Comment:**

Comments from the public expressed a recommendation for CPC members to spend time with their respective CPG on these issues, the need for the City to budget their part to enforce recommendations, to not let anecdotal information drive policy, but to let data do that, and to understand what impact do CPGs really have on housing policy and climate change. Another comment expressed the need to specify renters on CPGs and to make CPGs as diverse as possible to result in better decisions.

**ITEM #7 - REPORTS TO CPC**

- Chair Report – Chair Wulfeck reported that the prohibition of slates during CPG elections is no longer enforced as a result of a lawsuit settlement in Peninsula and referenced City Council Resolution from September 2019 RR-312659

**ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: NOVEMBER 26, 2019:** The meeting was adjourned by Chair Wally Wulfeck at 9:30 PM.