

# Clairemont Community Planning Group

Minutes of the Meeting of  
December 3, 2019  
Alcott Elementary School Auditorium

P Naveen Waney - <b>Chair</b> P Nicholas Reed – <b>Vice Chair</b> A Gary Christensen - <b>Secretary</b> A Delana Hardacre- <b>Treasurer</b>	P Harry Backer P Kevin Carpenter P Cecelia Frank P Chad Gardner	P Richard Jensen P Michael Brewer A Ryan Rolla P Carol Schleisman	P Glen Schmidt A Susan Mournian P Billy Paul P Erin Cullen
--	--	--	---

P – Present    A – Absent    L-Late

**Item 1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Chair Naveen Waney called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. 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:**

- Lisa Johnson: Clairemont High drama presents Charles Dicken's 'A Christmas Carol', the next two weekends
- Michael Dwyer: Clairemont times, articles on Navy flyer's heroism, Wills
- Chad: defended board over social media posts regarding professional involvement creating conflicts of interest, speaking for himself and others in the design and construction industry sitting on the board.
- Harry: concerned about road conditions, particularly in light of the recent rain events and ongoing trolley construction
- Billy: concerned about gang shootings and encouraged citizen reporting. Also unhappy with this special meeting not being included on November minutes
- Nick: reported on CPC actions; were not consistent with CCPG vote. Observed comments from CPC chair about discouraging public comment were concerning. Reported on final pour on Moraga roundabouts.

**Item 3. Modifications to the Agenda**

- None

**Item 4. Informational Item:**

**501. Genesee Retail Center – SDP – PTS: 64117 – Applicant: Glenn Linthicum**

- 5017 sf project with type 5 sprinklers
- One building (2) suites.
- Varied forms; stucco, metal canopy, stone veneer finishes.
- Pedestrian friendly, bikeway, and ZEV parking.
- Board Comments:
  - Kevin – parking lot needs development, trees need to be properly maintained, not reduced to stumps. Noted city will likely require more sweeping improvements to parking as well as landscaping and storm water.
  - Glen – Install trees as trees not shrubs. Concerned about planting species accuracy and placement on plans suggests a denser plant palette. Questions tower element noted it is awkward.
    - Applicant-Tower is for signage, over height by 2'.
  - Erin – Derrick street is very rough and needs a lot of help.
  - Billy – Is there pedestrian seating? Suggest a clock on breezeway.
    - Applicant-Yes.
  - Richard – Does the site have 3 landlords? Who is the proposed tenant? Monument sign included?
    - Applicant-two, Sprouts and Pep Boy's are part of this property, strip mall is owned by others. Fast casual dining, like Habit and ATT store. Monument incorporated in landscape, existing is to remain.

- Chad – Looks forward to PRS presentation. Happy to see development. Any plans for development of the main buildings? Would like to see cohesive approach to the whole site.
  - Applicant-no, locked up in leases.
- Naveen – Would also like to see how the sign comments will be addressed.
- Public Comment:
  - Will Sprouts remain?
    - Yes.
  - Is the parking behind in the plans for improvement?
    - Yes, will be improved and lighting added.
  - Where is the loading dock?
    - Main building loading docks to remain, new buildings will load from front doors in off hours.
  - Is there a safe way to use the rear parking?
    - Yes, will be reviewed.
  - Naveen – What's the status of the Verizon tower?
    - Unknown on the other parcel.

#### **Item 5. Action Items:**

#### **401. Count of San Diego Mt. Etna/Former Crime Lab Housing Project Community Plan Amendment (CPA) Applicant Omar Passons, County of San Diego**

- Noted questions on EIR are outside this discussion.
- Noted abbreviated presentation will be given due to previous presentations already given.
- Acknowledges there will be opposition, understands that many will not be happy.
- Noted HHSA is trying to address crises of seniors becoming homeless, county must play a role in addressing regional affordability crises
- Community plan amendment sought.
- No project backed yet with elevations etc.
- County has only requested to change community plan, this would help the developer as the rest of the process would be ministerial.
- Beneficial project location because the County already owns the land also located in the community it serves.
- Traffic pushback has been heard.
- Let us work through the process, school, wastewater, fire, etc. said no impacts to them.
- Traffic evaluation showed insignificant on 20 locations, significant at 6. All issues must be taken together.
- Height concern heard but the County only has obligation and commitment to meet the needs of affordable housing.
- Outreached to many groups, responded to on street exit, some changes made based on input so far but some were not possible.
- Alternative zoning for commercial use would lead to even higher traffic impact.
- Community amendment is only a draft.
- Senior center would be located onsite.
- Subcommittee Report Michael Brewer:
  - Looked at project with respect to community plan.
  - Planned goals are low density, commercial services, reduction of congestion on Balboa.
  - Primary goal preserve single family, locate higher density near commercial and transit, maintain parking.
  - LU-D 10,12 primary points in conflict.
  - Applicant will not be providing planned commercial, not adhering to setbacks, does not promote safe pedestrian access.
  - Project in conflict with the character of Clairemont.
  - Observed that Omar's presentation mischaracterized board comments to amendment, fuzzy language about what was currently written included in Omar's presentation.
  - Subcommittee does not recommend approval.
  - Specific community concerns on EIR
  - Fire service from existing station, won't there be more calls for this many people particularly if elderly and disabled?
  - EIR on vehicle trips, cannot endorse that kind of increase.
  - TDA improvements will not exist for 13 years, is the community to endure congestion for that long?
- Board Comments:

- Naveen-What are the amendment requests in a nutshell?
  - Applicant-No possible in a sentence. Concurred with "Density increase, zoning, height"
- Billy-Sorrento Towers is under parked, seniors all have cars and/or motorhomes. Street parking impacted. How many spaces do you have? Seniors and disabled still drive.
  - Applicant-405 units and preliminarily 465, do not intend to under park.
- Richard-Agrees with subcommittee findings, terrible idea, asks for permissions with no plans. Doubts anything less than 400 would be build, and no concessions have been granted. There will be 5 generations impacted by this change. cycle issues posted?
  - Applicant-will check, height and zero setback and relief from articulation are being sought and are acceptable. Buddy denies this is the case. No other projects are this dense, solving the housing issue in one place is not acceptable.
- Cecelia-What are the percentages of seniors and families?
  - Applicant-150 seniors, 250 family housing.
- Harry-Agrees with Richard, does not like the fact we are being bullied, other developments are coming up, and this sets a bad precedent. Wants a project to review just like all the other developers must provide.
- Michael-Wants a project, but understands compromise is needed.
- Chad-Appreciates the efforts of the subcommittee, it not against a project. understand it's not a project but as presented it's totally against the community plan. Cited Bayview Plaza's applicant willingness to work with the community.
- Kevin-Disappointed with the County's approach, particularly since they have shown good goals on other projects, including sustainability and net zero goals. Noted it's not acceptable to settle the housing crisis in Clairemont just because they own property here. 100% affordable has been tried over and over and has failed, referred to the monumental failures of the 'Projects' in Chicago. 400 units creates its own community. This must be reviewed as a project. supports height at this location since the adjacent medical offices and SDG&E pylons are already over 100', cannot support more than 200 units and only 15% should be affordable.
- Erin-You are asking us to pass this request to see what's in it, then we're screwed.
- Carol-Will this housing have an expiration date? What community input was implemented? Community wants 30', maybe 45' what are you asking? Should only be 200 units with commercial on ground level.
  - Applicant-55 years locked in, 99 years per agreement with the county. Ingress and egress driveway, parking on SDG&E easement, screening, added a senior center. Up to 70' is requested, heights will be varied, developer does not want to build a box so height is needed.
- Nick-Does not have enough basis to comment, not sure if supports, plans to abstain.
- Public Comment:
  - What is the ability for 911 calls and firefighters, there will be a lot more calls? Agrees with concerns cited, concerned with parking requested are suspect.
  - Thomas Kirby: EIR underestimated traffic by 60%. Does not account for lack of through streets in Clairemont topography. Agrees with 200-unit cap
  - Cris Rodea:, Cedes to Lisa
  - Lisa: lots of holes in EIR, safety and traffic assessment. County as lead agent is reviewing own work, sounds suspect. Traffic study did not account for plan updates and is based on SANDAG numbers of 2.04 trip per unit, which are too low. General plan says impacts should be identified on the community level. Fire station 36 gets 3000 calls, so this number should be basis for number of calls per community served
  - Morey Yahini: agrees with board views in opposition. Requests that the county actually listen to the community, and the developer as well. Disagrees that impacts are not significant
  - Julie Wilds: Clairemont Cares letter sent to Mark Cass about EIR. Competing priorities Omar cites are right, unit count and height are too high for Clairemont.
  - Don Booth: there is no plan, words mean nothing, disappointed with Omar's response, and he turned his back on him. This project must start on paper.
  - Janet Ingersoll: opposes proposals because of density and transportation impacts. Should be a compromise made. Cannot solve housing crisis on one project, agrees that integrated 20% affordable should have been implemented all along on projects, not create a separate community within Clairemont
  - Tsosie Reyhner: Laughs at the nods made at transit, nothing is being offered now and in the future even compares to bay area's transit services for similar density.
  - Lynn Booth: attended meetings and feels we are at a disadvantage, County and developer are paid for their time, we are not. Compromise would be reasonable, 200. EIR is laughable. Many impacts in the "insignificant"

category, "significant" few, concerned about minimization of emergency services, concerned about canyon fire risks

- Candy Coming: Experienced canyon fire in Clairemont in 1987, occurred during the day when there was little traffic. Canyon was fully ablaze by the time trucks arrived. This building needs a ladder truck that is not from far away and does not have to come through traffic from another part of town.
- Carol: Concerned with Homelessness. Where are homeless people sleeping? Saw the sunset of low-income housing built in St. Luis, transforming to market rate and community no longer served.
- Joel Smith: concerned about the assertion that the board does not represent community input
- Naveen Char Wrap Up- Thanked board for commenting with respect, feels he himself was not able to do full research, like NR. Is not opposed to the project, ok with busting height, but uncomfortable with 400. Density does not feel right. Does not want to grant blank check. Wants to work to manage project to success. Does not support zero setback. Feels County can bring this home, with cooperation with the community.
- Omar-Mix of units, 22k-90k income spread. Issue of what is in the community plan, cites objectives to locate transportation and commercial, which are being met. Traffic impacts insignificant vs. significant clarified. Relate to threshold of capacity to carry cars, and delay at intersections, and what Triggers for mitigation. Cited that the City of SD approves the plan amendment, not County. City will make the judgement. Stressed that the County/HHSA wants to help communities struggling with housing
- Buddy-Funding AHSC program is being sought before a deadline, essentially cap and trade for funding, connectivity improvements, increasing bus transit funding, bicycle path.
  - Michael-Is that funding offered annually, and has Chelsea won before?
    - Offered Year to year, have been successful, 5 awards over the last 3 years.
- Michael-Motion to not recommend approval of the CPA as currently presented. Second – Carol
  - Billy-Should include reasons, can attach subcommittee findings and minutes.
  - Chad-Agree, motion well written. Discouraged that County is not hearing this community.
  - Kevin-Cited that Planning Commission was derogatory and negative toward Clairemont on previous sessions and will override us a NIMBY's if we do not expand the motion text.
  - Naveen-Agrees.
- Michael- Amended Motion: Clairemont Community Planning Group agrees that affordable housing in this location is appropriate but does not agree with the CPA as presented as detailed in the subcommittee's presentation and main meeting's minutes.
- 10-0-1 (Nick abstains on grounds of insufficient information, Glen recuses.