Planning Department

2021 Community Orientation Workshop (COW)
REMINDER: THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED
1. Welcome
2. Introduction & Review of Purpose and Structure of Workshop
3. Greetings to Planning Group Members
4. Roles & Responsibilities of Community Planning Groups
5. Presentation: Development Review Process, Discretionary Permits, CEQA, & OpenDSD
6. Break
7. Presentation: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Regional Plan/RTP
8. Guest Q&A Panel
9. Conclusion of Workshop
Mike Hansen, AICP
Director, Planning Department
Planning Department

Shannon Mulderig
Associate Planner

Lesley Henegar
Senior Planner

Nathen Causman
Associate Planner

Katie Witherspoon
Senior Planner
• Council Policy 600-24
• Ralph M. Brown Act
• Community Planning Group Bylaws
• Indemnification Ordinance
• Robert’s Rules of Order
Council Policy 600-24:
Standard Operating Procedures and Responsibilities of Recognized Community Planning Groups
• Role of community planning groups as advisory bodies
• Sets standards in exchange for indemnification
• Role of Community Planners Committee (Council Policy 600-09)
Article I: Name

- Name
- Boundaries
- Positions & Opinions
• Advisory recommendation
• Project review
• City staff assistance
• Nonpartisan/nonsectarian
• Political elections & ballot initiatives
• Timely review and response to projects
Who is the main point of contact if you have questions about a project the community planning group is reviewing?

a) The Development Project Manager – Development Services Department
b) Community Planner – Planning Department
c) The project applicant
Article III: Organization

- Quantity of members
- Recognized members
- Representative of community / eligibility
- Terms
- Retain eligibility
- Compliance / Violations
• Declaring vacancies
• Filling vacancies
• Inability to fill vacancies
Article V: Elections

• Meeting minimum attendance requirement
• Publicizing elections
• Voting
  ➢ Secret written ballot
  ➢ No proxy voting allowed
  ➢ Voting times
Q2

Can an employee of a local business owner cast a ballot on behalf of that business owner?

a) Yes, without restrictions
b) Yes, but only if the employee has a notarized letter granting him/her permission to vote
c) No, proxy voting is not permitted
• Cooperatively work with City staff
• Conduct meetings as civil, public decision-making processes open to the public
• Follow Brown Act provisions
Meeting requirements

• Transparent & open deliberations

• Public right to attend & provide comment
  - Notice requirements
  - 72 hours for normal meeting; 24 hours for special meeting
  - Agenda descriptions
Meeting Procedures

• Regular meeting agenda posting
• Quorum and public attendance
• Public comment
• Adjournments & continuances
• Consent agenda
If a Community Planning Group has 15 seats, but 2 of those seats are vacant, how many members need to be in attendance in order to conduct business (have a quorum)?

a) 8 members
b) 7 members
c) All active members of the board
How long can the public comments on an agenda item go for?

a) Indefinitely
b) The CPG Chair can place time limits
c) 1.33 minutes
Meeting Procedures

• Development project review
• Action on agenda items
• Special meetings
• Emergency meetings (not allowed)
• Right to record
• Disorderly conduct
Q5 What step(s) need to be taken in order to add an action item to the agenda during a meeting?

a) A two-thirds vote is needed from the planning group

b) It must be determined by a vote that immediate action is needed on the item

c) The need for action on the item came to the attention of the Planning Group subsequent to the agenda being posted

d) All of the above
How can a CPG organize a Special Meeting?

a) With an email sent 2 hours before the meeting

b) Chairs may call a special meeting with a 24-hours advance posted notice as required

c) With a phone call to all members of the board
Subcommittees

• Standing Subcommittees
• Ad Hoc Subcommittees

Meeting Documents & Records

• Agendas
• Minutes
• Records Retention
Q7

If a subcommittee votes on a project, can that vote bypass the CPG and move straight to the City as the formal recommendation?

a) Yes, but only if the CPG attempted to take a vote on the project, but was unable to get a quorum

b) No, in no case may a subcommittee recommendation be forwarded directly to the City as the formal recommendation

c) Yes, without restrictions
**Recusal**

- **Direct Economic Interest in the project**
  - Member must state that they are recusing
  - Member must not participate in discussions as a planning group member
  - Recused member *does not* count towards quorum
  - Recused member may not vote (not calculated in majority vote)

**Abstention**

- **State up-front (Preferred)**
  - Knowing you will not be voting on the action item
    - Counts as a quorum
    - Vote counted as abstention (not calculated in majority vote)

- **Not known up-front**
  - Declare abstention at the end of the discussion
    - Counts as a quorum
    - Vote counted as abstention (not calculated in majority vote)
Planning Department

• Community outreach
• Planning group documents
  ➢ Roster
  ➢ Annual Report
• Financial contributions
Article VII: Officers

- Chairperson
- Vice Chairperson
- Secretary
- Other officers
Indemnification & representation

• Indemnification Ordinance (2009)
• Defense and Indemnity for CPG and its members
• Must meet all required circumstances
Brown Act remedies & penalties

- In substantial conformance if CPG members follow bylaws
- Further information of Brown Act and Council Policy

CP 600-24 Violations & remedies

- Member violations
- Group violations
• Community Planning Workshops Web Page: (COW HANDBOOK)
  https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/resources

• Community Planning Group Web Page:
  www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg/

• Community Planning Group Email:
  SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov

• Community Planning Group Contact List:
  https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/contacts

• Brown Act Resources
  California Attorney General
  http://oag.ca.gov/open-meetings
  League of Cities
  http://www.cacities.org/Resources/Open-Government
Development Review Process, Discretionary Permits, CEQA, & OpenDSD

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Regional Plan/RTP

Guest Panel Q&A
Community Planning Group
Reviewing Development Projects

Raynard Abalos, DSD/Deputy Director
RAbalos@sandiego.gov

Tim Daly, DSD/Assistant Deputy Director
Tpdaly@sandiego.gov

Anna McPherson, DSD/Program Manager
AMcPherson@sandiego.gov

David Saborio, DSD/Development Project Manager III
DSaborio@sandiego.gov
Presentation Overview

• DSD Online Resources
• Types of Discretionary Approvals
• Decision Process Levels
• Public Projects
• CPG and DPM Roles
• Findings
• CPG Conditions and Recommendations
• Public Hearing Documents
• Appeals
• CEQA Reviews
Digital Resources: DSD Main Webpage

http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services
Digital Resources: OpenDSD

https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search
Digital Resources: OpenDSD
https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search
Digital Resources: Accela
Digital Resources: GIS and Zoning Maps

https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/zoning
Digital Resources: Archived Projects

https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/records
Digital Resources: Open Data Portal

https://data.sandiego.gov/datasets/?department=development-services
Digital Resources: Municipal Code
https://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/legisdocs/muni
**Development Process Webpage**

Project Reviews: What You Will Receive

https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search

From: City of San Diego, Development Services Department
Project Number: PTS/6574/03 - Z2 & Broadway
Review Due Date: August 17, 2021
Document Links:
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf
- https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/DevelopmentServices/Projects/Regulatory/ProjectCorrespondence/PTSDOC-00044540.pdf

Agencies and Reviewers Outside the City or
City Departments without Project Tracking System (PTS) Access:
- Access OpenSDC at https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search and input the Project Number to view review status and applicant or SDG contact information.
- Direct questions to the "SDG Contact" listed in OpenSDC. Do not contact the sender of this email.
- To change the designated contact for your department/agency, please email the request to SDG@finance.sandiego.gov.

City Departments with Project Tracking System (PTS) Access:
- Complete your review in PTS prior to the due date listed above. Indicate in your comments if you would like to receive future submittals of this project. No further project submittals will be provided unless specifically requested.

Community Planning Groups:
- Review the project and provide a recommendation as outlined in Information Bulletin No. 046, by completing/submitting a recommendation via the CPG Form, which is provided on page 3 of 8620.

Instructions for all Outside Agencies, Planning Groups and City Departments:
- Access the project submittal documents using the links above. Download and save the documents so you can access them after the links are updated or expire.
Project Reviews: Drawings

https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search
Project Reviews: Studies

https://opendsd.sandiego.gov/Web/Approvals/Search
Two Types of Approvals

- **Ministerial**: Administrative decision by City staff (e.g. building permits)

- **Discretionary**: Approval or Denial by a Decision Maker after public notice and/or public hearing (e.g. Coastal & Site Development Permits, subdivisions)
“Entitlement” Definition

• Process of obtaining legal approvals required to develop land for a desired use

• Can describe Ministerial and Discretionary processes but most typically Discretionary
Ministerial Approvals

- Staff-level decision
- “By Right” construction permits
- Little or no discretion/subjective judgment
- Use of fixed standards & objective measurements
- No public notice, appeal process or CPG input
- Building, grading, electrical, plumbing permits
Discretionary Approvals

- Exercise of judgment/deliberation
- Decision Maker uses discretion to approve or deny
- Legal findings must be made to support the decision
- Requires public notice, decision may be appealed
- CPG recommendation requested per Council Policy 600-24
- Not a construction building permit; development plans are conceptual
- Approval required based on scope and location
# Common Discretionary Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Type</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Development Permit:</td>
<td>Coastal Overlay Zone development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Map:</td>
<td>To subdivide property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone/Plan Amendment:</td>
<td>To change allowed land uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Permit:</td>
<td>Allow zone flexibility/deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit:</td>
<td>To allow uses conditionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance:</td>
<td>Relief from regulations when warranted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development Permit:</td>
<td>Impacts to environmentally lands, or surrounding areas, CPIOZ's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision Process Levels

- **Process 1** – City Staff, Ministerial, no appeals
- **Process 2** – City Staff, Appeal to Planning Comm.
- **Process 3** – Hearing Officer, Appeal to Planning Comm.
- **Process 4** – Planning Commission, Appeal to Council
- **Process 5** – City Council, Final Decision, no appeal

*Processes 2-5 are Discretionary Actions*
Decision Process Levels

- The higher the decision level the more project complexity
- The higher the decision level, more discretion involved
- Processing costs increase with decision level
- Most Council decisions require a Planning Commission recommendation as well
Decision Processes

**PROCESS ONE, Ministerial, City Staff**

- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Staff Decision To Approve/Deny

**PROCESS TWO, Discretionary, City Staff**

- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Staff Decision To Approve/Deny
- Appeal filed to Planning Commission
- Appeal Hearing by Planning Commission

**PROCESS THREE, Discretionary, Hearing Officer**

- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Hearing Officer Hearing
- Appeal Filed to Planning Commission
- Appeal Hearing by Planning Commission

**PROCESS FOUR, Discretionary, Planning Commission**

- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Planning Commission Hearing
- Appeal Filed to City Council
- Appeal Hearing by City Council

**PROCESS FIVE, Discretionary, City Council**

- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Planning Commission Recommendation Hearing
- City Council Hearing
What is a Public Project?

• Generally located on City property or public right-of-way
• Originates from a City dept, lessee or other gov’t agency
• Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)
• Includes Fire & Lifeguard Stations, Parks, Utilities, Libraries, Roads, Parks, Trails, etc.
• CIP Info: https://www.sandiego.gov/cip/projectinfo
• CIP’s have Discretionary DPM as well
Public Project Process

• Process 2 CIP – SDMC sec. 112.0602
• Process 5 CIP – SDMC sec. 112.0604
• Process 2, Public Service Easement Vacations
• Process 2 CIP appeals heard by City Council
• Same submittal requirements as a private project
• Project & funding approved annually in Engineering and Capital Improvement budget
CIP Decision Processes

**PROCESS TWO - CIP**
- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- Staff Decision To Approve/Deny
- Appeal filed to City Council
- Appeal Hearing by City Council

**PROCESS FIVE - CIP**
- Application/Plans Submitted
- Staff Level Review
- City Council Hearing
Planning Department

Decision Maker vs. Advisory Body

• Community Planning Group and City reviewers are advisory
• Advisory bodies make recommendations not project decisions
• DSD, HO, PC and CC are Decision Makers
• Only Decision Maker can approve/deny a project
• Decision Maker may not follow advisory recommendations (use of discretion)
Community Group Role

• “Technical Expert” for your adopted community plan
• Review projects based on adopted Community Plan and General Plan elements and goals
• Provide clear and timely recommendations
• Work with the project applicant at community level
The Community Group Member

• City Council Policy No. 600-24

• Info Bulletin 620 “Community Planning Committees”
Development Project Managers

- All Discretionary projects require a DPM
- DPM manages the multi-discipline review team
- City’s single point of contact for the project application processing
- Prepares assessment letters, staff reports, draft permits, findings, and required approval documents
- Presents the project at City public hearings
- Advocates for the City’s PROCESS not the project
Project Submittals

- Project plans & application routed to CPG by City
- CPG is a reviewer in City’s Project Tracking System
- DPM enters CPG comments into system
- Additional submittals with significant changes sent to CPG along with Assessment Letters
- CPG cannot require additional submittal documents
Step 1: Customer with a Project Requiring City Action

Step 2: Customer Submits Complete Plans/Documents to the City

Step 3: City Staff and Comm. Planning Group Review of the Project

Step 4: Are there Unresolved Issues (Including Environmental Review)?

- YES: DPM Prepares Assessment Letter
- NO: Go to Step 5

Step 5: Project Scheduled for a Public Hearing or a Staff Decision is Made

Step 6: Permit Issued if Project Approved and Ministerial Permits, Inspection Begins
Assessment Letters

• Prepared by City DPM
• Valuable tool for applicant and CPG
• Outlines project issues, required permits, process level, next steps, resubmittal instructions
• CPG Chair receives copies of all Assessment Letters
• Available approx. 5 weeks after 1st submittal
• Prepared for each subsequent review
CPG Impact on Project Schedule

- Coordinate with project applicant’s and review projects as soon as possible
- Environmental review timing
- Public hearing schedule timing
- Information items vs. action items
- Amount and role of subcommittees
- Is project enhanced through timely public dialog?
Reviewing Plans

- Standard submittal requirements:
  - Title Sheet, Site Plan, Grading Plan, Landscape Plan, Public Improvement Plan, Floor Plans, Roof Plans, Elevations, Cross Sections, Renderings, etc
- Use your resources, technical experts on board?
- You are a Community Plan expert!
- Asking for additional information?
Community Plans

Are a public document which contains specific proposals for future land uses and public improvements in a given community.

They are part of the City's General Plan. It provides tailored policies and a long-range physical development guide for elected officials and citizens engaged in community development.

- Policy documents, subjective, not ordinance
- Policy vs. Regulation
- Community Plans are implemented by zoning
- Okay to be subjective
- Discretion is required, so opinions will vary
- Relate issues back to findings to validate opinions
What is a Finding?

Findings means determinations based upon a statement or set of statements of factual evidence that are used as the criteria for making a decision on a discretionary action. (SDMC sec. 113.0103)

The result of a judicial examination or inquiry - the results of an investigation (Merriam Webster Dictionary)
Basic Findings

• “The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan”;

• “The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare”; and

• “The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code”.

Importance of Findings

• Findings are located in the permit resolution
• Legal basis for decision makers approval or denial
• Findings are subjective (discretionary)
• Relating your recommendations/conditions to the findings gives your issues weight
• Clearly state why findings can or cannot be made
• Framing discussion in findings keeps meeting on track
Tips for Successful CPG Review

• Focus on conformity with the adopted Community Plan
• Frame issues within the type application’s permit findings
• Take formal action (avoid continuances)
• Project review should be timely
• Communicate with City DPM via the Chair of CPG
• Approve meeting minutes as soon as possible
CPG Conditions

- Must have a nexus (connection) to impact
- Must have a trigger (i.e. prior to building permit)
- Proportional to scope and requested action
- Enforceable and measurable
- Some conditions may not be included in permit
- Applicant may or may not agree to CPG conditions
CPG Recommendations

• Community Planning Committee Distribution Form Part 1 and 2, or
• Include actual vote count
• List conditions, clarify if applicant agreed
• Provide backup documentation
• Relate to findings
• Email to DPM, sooner the better!
• Written recommendation is your primary tool
**Hearing Staff Reports**

- CPG vote a critical component of the process
- CPG vote included prominently in all staff reports
- CPG’s concerns addressed in Report
- CPG’s minutes included as report attachment
Public Hearing Information

City’s Public Hearing agendas, reports, and minutes available on-line:

• Hearing Officer: https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/public-hearings-meetings-notices/hearing-officer

• Planning Commission: https://www.sandiego.gov/planning-commission

• City Council: https://www.sandiego.gov/council-agendas
Appealing Project Decisions

- Information Bulletin No. 505, “Appeal Procedure”
  [https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/dsdib505.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/dsdib505.pdf)

- If appealing a project as CPG chairperson, appeal basis must be consistent with community group vote and appeal fee is waived.

- Appeal application must be complete and submitted in a timely manner.

- Be as specific as possible, individually list appeal points to provide a clear basis. Use Findings!

- Be clear on appeal form if you are appealing the decisions for the “project”, the “environmental”, or both decisions
What is CEQA?

California Environmental Quality Act (est. 1970)

**Process** triggered by a discretionary action to disclose to the public and decision-makers the environmental impacts of development projects.

Requires identification and adoption of feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives for the significant environmental effects of project.
CEQA Process

Responsibilities

Produce a legally defensible document and, pursuant to Section 128.0103(b) of the Land Development Code, an unbiased impact analysis - disclosure.

Unlike other members of the DSD reviewing team, EAS does not make any recommendation to approve or deny a project.

Maintains independence and objectivity while conducting the environmental review. This mandate is emphasized in City Attorney’s Opinion Number 95-2.
CEQA Process

1. Action proposed
2. Decide if action is a project
3. Decide if the project is subject to CEQA
4. Decide if the project is exempt; if exempt prepare NORA and NOE
5. If not exempt, prepare an Initial Study
CEQA Process

6. Make an environmental document determination
7. Prepare appropriate environmental document
8. Public review
9. Certify EIR/adopt ND, project approval, findings
10. Notice of Determination
CEQA Implementation

CEQA Applies to a “Project”

• A “Project” is an activity which may cause a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following:

  • An activity directly undertaken by any public agency,
  • An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies,
  • An activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies.
CEQA Implementation

Analysis

- CEQA Statutes and Guidelines
- Significance Thresholds
- Land Development Code
- Technical Reports
- Biology Guidelines
- Historical Resources Guidelines
- Community Plans

Development Services Department
CEQA Implementation

Coordination

Within DSD
- Fire Prevention Officer
- Transportation Engineers
- Hydrology/Water Quality Engineers
- Geologists
- Biologists
- Historical Resources Specialists
- Noise Experts
- Permit Planners
- Landscape Planners

Planning (Policy Division)
- Long Range Planners
- Multiple Species Conservation Program Staff

Other Agencies
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- County Environmental Health
- County Air Pollution Control District
CEQA Implementation

Significance Determination Thresholds

• Thresholds provide staff with guidance on determining the significance of an impact.
• If an impact is determined to be significant, mitigation or an Environmental Impact Report is required.
• Periodically updated based upon new issues areas, research, case law.
CEQA Implementation

Exemptions

• **Statutory Exemptions**
  • These are exemptions granted by the Legislature for certain types of projects, and programs, i.e. pipelines, emergency projects, feasibility and planning studies.

• **Categorical Exemptions**
  • Used to exempt certain types of discretionary projects which have been determined through Preliminary Review (CEQA Guidelines Section 15060) not to have a significant effect on the environment.
CEQA Implementation

Environmental Documents

- **Negative Declaration (ND)**
  - No significant effect.

- **Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)**
  - Significant effects are mitigated.

- **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** – “If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency that a project may have a significant effect”
CEQA Implementation

What elevates a project to an EIR?

**MNDs**
- all significant impacts mitigated through conditions of project approval
- no project alternatives are analyzed
- Cumulative impact analysis required but no separate, explicit discussion required
- Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations not required

**EIRs**
- project may be approved with significant unmitigated impacts
- project alternatives are analyzed
- Cumulative impacts are separately analyzed
- Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations must be adopted
CEQA Implementation

Public Review

• Notice of Preparation (EIR only)
• 20-30 days for ND or MND
• 30-45 days for EIR

• Staff responds to public comments. Environmental document revised if necessary.
Recirculation of an environmental document required pursuant to Sections 15073.5 and 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines:

• A new significant impact requiring new mitigation is identified.

• A previously identified impact is found to be significantly increased, and new mitigation is required to reduce the impact to a level below significance.

• Change in circumstances occur which would result in a new or significantly increased impact.
CEQA Implementation

Subsequent Review – 15162 Analysis

No subsequent document unless:

• Substantial changes are proposed in the project which result in new or increased significant effects, or

• Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken and result in new or increased significant effects, or

• New information shows:
  - New significant effects
  - More severe significant effects
  - New mitigation measures are determined feasible
CEQA Implementation

Subsequent Documents

• If the conditions in Section 15162 are met, a subsequent EIR/M/ND, a Supplement to an EIR (Section 15163) or an Addendum to an EIR/M/ND pursuant to Section 15164 can be prepared.

• For Addenda:

  • Minor or Technical Changes to project

  • There can be no new significant impacts or substantial increase in previously disclosed impacts.

  • There is no CEQA requirement for public review of an addendum.
CEQA Implementation

Project Decision

Notice of Right to Appeal the Environmental Determination (NORA)

• For all Exemptions and Environmental Documents prepared under a Process 2 decision.
• Notice covers 10 Business Days
• Notice is distributed to the district’s Council Member, the Community Planning Chair, and any interested parties.
CEQA Implementation

Project Decision

• Certify/adopt environmental document or note Exemption
• Approve project
• Notice of Determination (NOD) and Notice of Exemption (NOE) Filed; sets time limits on legal challenges
CEQA Implementation
Land Development Code Regulations

Does not allow appeals of:

- Previously certified documents and addenda
- Decisions already subject to Council approval or appeal to Council:
CEQA Implementation

Additional Resources

**CEQA Statutes, Guidelines and Cases**
http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/

**City CEQA Implementation Ordinances**
http://clerkdoc.sanmet.gov/legtrain/mc/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art08Division01
http://clerkdoc.sanmet.gov/legtrain/mc/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art08Division02

**City Significance Thresholds**
DSD Contact Information

- Development Services Department webpage; https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services
- Development Services Department Location and Contact Information webpage; https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/locations-hours
Thank you for your participation!

ANY QUESTIONS?
City of San Diego Community Orientation Workshop
June 7, 2021
A Vision for the 2021 Regional Plan
A bold new approach to planning for the future

Embracing data-driven planning, leveraging emerging technologies, and incorporating resident input
Three Challenges

• Reduce congestion
• Improve social equity
• Meet state and federal mandates to be faster, fairer, and cleaner
Data-Driven Planning: Where people live and work

Population Density
May 2019

Sparse
Dense

Making Critical Connections

Trips
High
Low

Major Employment Centers

SANDAG
San Diego FORWARD

SANDAG
San Diego
Data-Driven Planning: Other regional trips
5 Big Moves
Inter-reliant strategies that work as one and enhance each other

Next OS
Complete Corridors
Flexible Fleets
Transit Leap
Mobility Hubs
Roadways are reimagined using the Complete Corridors and Next OS concept.
Transit Leap and Mobility Hub improvements could transform the travel experience.
Flexible Fleets could expand the reach of transit
A Bold New Vision
Fast, Fair, Clean

San Diego FORWARD
Stay Connected

EXPLORE THE VISION
SDForward.com/envision

ATTEND A VIRTUAL MEETING
SDForward.com/calendar

SIGN UP TO OUR PROJECT EMAIL LIST
SDForward.com/subscribe

SUBMIT A COMMENT
SDForward.com/comments

EMAIL US
SDForward@sandag.org

FOLLOW US ON SOCIAL MEDIA
@SANDAGregion @SANDAG

#SDForward #5BigMoves
- Bill Hofman, Planning Commission Chair
- Marlon Pangilinan, Senior Planner, Planning Department
- Noah Brazier, Deputy City Attorney, City Attorney’s Office
- Kelly Modén, Planning Commissioner
- Ken Malbrough, Planning Commissioner
- Wally Wulfeck, Community Planners Committee Chair
- Frisco White, AIA, Community Planners Committee Chair
Thank You!