

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego
9485 Aero Drive, MS 413 • San Diego, CA 92123
SDPlanningGroups@saniego.gov • (619)-235-520

Tuesday, May 28th, 2024

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

TIME: 6:15-8:35 p.m.
Cathy Hopper Friendship Center
4425 Bannock Street, Clairemont 92117

-
- NOTE: If a Sign Language interpretation or language translation services are required, please visit www.sandiego.gov/planning/translation to submit a request at least (3) three workdays prior to the meeting date to insure availability. Times assigned for each item are approximate. The order of agenda items may be modified at the beginning of the meeting at the discretion of the Chair.
- ITEM #1 - 6:15 **CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA:** Meeting may be recorded.
- ITEM #2 - 6:20 **NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT** - 2 minutes per issue
Identification of issues that are within the jurisdiction of the CPC, but not on the agenda. No discussion or action is permitted, except to establish a subcommittee for study, or place the item on a future agenda.
- ITEM #3 - 6:30 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 23rd, 2024 and ROLL CALL**
- ITEM #4 - 6:35 **BLUEPRINT SAN DIEGO (ACTION ITEM)** - Suchi Lukes and Nathan Causmen will go over the public comments received on Blueprint San Diego and the changes that will be presented to the Planning Commission. CPC will make final recommendations.
- ITEM #5 - 7:35 **GRAND JURY REPORT (ACTION ITEM)** - CPC will review the work of the Grand Jury Subcommittee. This includes four different letters that are each seeking approval.
- ITEM#6 - 8:05 **ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS** - CPC member requests to form a subcommittee to evaluate the changes being made to the code that limits public comment about impacts on environmentally sensitive lands.

ITEM#7 - 8:10 **E-Board Election Results** - Michelle Addington will announce the results from the E-Board election. Ballots will be handed out to all voting members at the beginning of the meeting.

ITEM#8 - 8:15 **CPG CHANGES UPDATES** - Marlon Pangilinan will go over the changes to CPGs and Council Policy 600-24 passed by the full City Council.

ITEM #9 - 8:25 **REPORTS TO CPC:**

- Staff Report
- Chair's Report
- CPC Member Comments

ITEM #10 - **ADJOURN TO NEXT MEETING, JUNE 25th**
8:35

COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE

San Diego, California

Top Ten Revisions to the Proposed “Blueprint SD” Project

The Community Planners Committee (CPC) held several hearings on the “Blueprint SD” project during 2023 - 2024 and created the CPC Blueprint Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

The recommendations are found in the report, “Community Planners Committee Blueprint SD Responses”. That document consists of detailed comments on each element of the Blueprint SD project, and an Executive Summary.

This document, the “Top Ten” is a companion to the complete report. The ten items selected are the most important of the needed additions to the proposed Blueprint SD project.

The Top Ten

1. At the time of Community Plan Updates, the latest population forecasts shall be obtained, and the community plan development capacity, existing and proposed, reconciled with the forecasts.
2. Urban design guidelines must include provisions which ensure that the unique attributes of the communities will be retained and enhanced.
3. Implementation provisions shall ensure that projects with a major impact on a community will trigger a discretionary review. This trigger may be based on height, number of housing units, size of non-residential building space, or size of the site.
4. Community Plan Updates are intended to result in adequate housing sites, and projects which are suitable in density, height, and form. To prevent overriding the new community plans, the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions ordinance shall be suspended in communities that complete a Community Plan Update after the adoption of Complete Communities: Housing Solutions.
5. In low-resource communities, policies shall include measures to improve access to employment opportunities and provide for full-service retail outlets. Housing shall provide a balance between market-rate housing and rent-restricted housing.
6. Community Plan Updates and infrastructure plans shall ensure that public facilities will be provided concurrent with development.
7. Parks and recreation planning is based on a community’s population. Therefore, the amount of authorized development and the projected buildout population must be proportional to the parks and recreation facilities which can feasibly be provided.
8. Develop incentives for adaptive reuse, to conserve embedded energy and limit the burdening of landfills with construction debris.
9. Improve protections for mature trees, to preserve the tree canopy. This will help to sequester carbon and reduce urban heat-island impacts.
10. When community plan updates occur, include an analysis of Land Value Capture to provide revenue for needed public facilities and community benefits.

Request for the Community Planners Committee to Review and Consider Potentially Detrimental Changes to the Review Process for Capital Improvement Projects Proposed in Environmentally Sensitive Lands

On December 12, 2021, the San Diego City Council approved changes to the Municipal Code that included reducing the level of review for Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects in Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) from Process Five to Process Two. This change eliminated the public hearing and public notice procedures required under Process Five, and replaced it with a process that allows a designated City staff member to make the final decision on how a CIP project is implemented on ESL.

CIP projects can be initiated by various departments, including, but not limited to Transportation/Stormwater, Public Utilities, and Park and Recreation/Open Space. When such projects are proposed in areas considered environmentally sensitive, such as coastal canyon lands, wetlands, and lands set aside for the protection of listed and sensitive species, they have the potential to significantly impact not only native species and habitat, but also native vegetation restored through a combination of grant funding and many hours of volunteer labor.

Under Process 5, for municipal CIP projects proposed in ESL, the City Manager was required to provide a Notice of Application to property owners and tenants within 300 feet of the development, as well as the affected community planning group(s), and any person who submits a written request for notification of the proposed development to the City staff person. Under Process 2, no public notice is required and City staff can make a final decision on the project without a public hearing. The result of this change has essentially removed the opportunity for those with knowledge about an area to be impacted by a CIP project to provide input on how and where sensitive resources should be protected. Further, community members may never learn of proposed projects affecting their own neighborhoods until after projects are approved.

To stay informed under Process Two, the public must now submit a written request for notification of future proposed projects in specific categories, of which community groups and nonprofits may not be aware. If informed of a pending project, they must provide any comments within 10 days of receiving a Notice of Future Decision. This is not adequate time for those concerned with the protection of ESL. Community planning groups generally only meet once a month, therefore, the current process does not provide time for an affected community to become familiar with a project and provide meaningful input.

The risks to ESL posed by this Code change include insufficient project noticing and review, along with the potential for significant loss of natural and restored native habitat. Vegetated with native flora, these ESL are the region's most affordable climate-adaptation buffers. Canyons and wetlands have valuable and sensitive biological resources underpinning pollination, biodiversity, rich vistas, and property values. Some areas have steep hillsides, which cannot be destabilized. As drainages, they may be floodplains and/or drain to floodplains, so their seasonal creeks require special care. When not maintained, canyons may be fire-prone, particularly when plagued with annual weeds that invade after native species are removed.

A request by individuals and organizations who have invested significant time and effort into the restoration of the City's canyon lands and other sensitive habitat areas has been made that the Community Planners Committee (CPC) establish a subcommittee to review the current issue and identify potential remedies. One remedy would be to submit a request for an amendment to the Code related to ensuring adequate opportunities for public review and input for projects affecting ESL. Code amendment requests for the next Land Development Code update are due by July 31, 2024. Therefore, any request related to a code change would have to be made by the CPC on or before the July 2024 CPC meeting. All those affected by this change to the Land Development Code appreciate the CPC's attention to this important issue.

Community Planners Committee

City Planning Department • City of San Diego
202 C Street, M.S. 413 • San Diego, CA 92101
SDPlanningGroups@saniego.gov • (619) 235-5200

CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative, Carmel Valley (CV)	Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)
Sally Smull, Chollas Valley-Encanto (CVE)	Paul Coogan, Normal Heights (NH)
Marcellus Anderson, City Heights (CH)	Lynn Elliot, North Park (NP)
Mike Wang, Clairemont Mesa (CM)	Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)
Tom Silva, College Area (CA)	Korla Equinta, Peninsula (PEN)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)	Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Victoria LaBruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
David Swarens, Golden Hill (GH)	Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)	Representative, Torrey Pines (TP)
Harry Bubbins, La Jolla (LJ)	Chris Nielsen, University (UNIV)
Felicity Senoski, Linda Vista (LV)	Matt Wahlstrom, Uptown (UP)
Bill Crooks, Miramar Ranch North (MRN)	

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:

The following planning group have single absences: CV and UP.

The following planning groups have double absences: MB and GGH.

Per Article IV, Section 5 and Section 6 of the CPC Bylaws the following planning groups have three (3) consecutive absences and will not be able to vote until recordation of attendance at two (2) consecutive CPC meetings by a designated representative or alternate: BL, CMR/SS, DMM, KM, MPH, MM, OTSD, OMN, PB, SPLH, SY, SE, TS and TH.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA:

Chair called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m. upon reaching quorum and roll call was conducted.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Non-agenda public comment included:

- A safety suggestion on virtual meeting practices was provided by Uptown's representative. CPC members were reminded to do their best in ensuring that virtual meeting spaces adhere to a Planning Group's meeting purposes.
- An update on the status of the City's Social Equity and Economic Development (SEED) program in the upcoming budget year was provided by a representative from Rancho Bernardo's planning group. CPC members were encouraged to follow up with Council members regarding this matter.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF March 26, 2024 and ROLL CALL:

Approval of the March 26th, 2024 minutes as revised:

Yea: CH, CA, EA, KT, LV, MRN, MV, NH, NP, OB, PEN, RB, SR, TP, UN

Nay: None.

Abstain: CV, CL, DT, GH, UP

Minutes approved as revised: 15-0-5

4. FORMATION OF A NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

CPC Chair Andrea Schlageter appointed Mission Valley's representative Michele Addington as the board member responsible for the Nominating Committee of a new Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary of the CPC.

There were no recorded objections from CPC members in attendance regarding this appointment.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT:

The CPC discussed providing a recommendation on the City's Environmental Justice [E.J.] Element. During discussion, CPC members expressed the following comments and concerns on this matter:

- Further consideration of environmental effects needed to be included in the E.J. Element., given ongoing environmental discussion within the City.
- Few groups felt that they had time to properly review the E.J. element, limiting their ability to provide a proper recommendation on the item.
- CPC members expressed interest in having City staff come to the various Planning Groups interesting in providing a recommendation. City staff would be present to support the Planning Groups as they interpret the E.J. Element currently proposed by the City and draft their own recommendations. This would allow for the Planning Groups to be more involved in the review process.

Motion by EA and seconded by RB to have City staff work more directly with the Planning Groups before the CPC would take further action on the Environmental Justice Element.

Yea: CV, CH, CM, CA, DT, EA, KT, LV, MRN, MV, NP, OB, PEN, RB, SR, SPH, TP, UN, UP
Nay: None.

Abstain: EN, GH, NH

Motion approved by vote of 19-0-3.

6. BLUEPRINT SAN DIEGO

City Planning Department staff presented the most recent draft of Blueprint San Diego to attending CPC members. City staff provided insight on context regarding the latest draft, its general approach and the drafting done with support from an ad-hoc CPC committee.

Public comment included the following:

- The presentation did not include a section about updates to the Historic Preservation Element, despite ongoing modifications to this Element. Per City staff's response, this is because there were no changes to the Historic Preservation Element which Blueprint San Diego would be involved in. The changes that are being drafted for the Historic Preservation Element involve the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a separate process from Blueprint San Diego.
- Confusion arose as to whether Blueprint San Diego was actually a Land Use plan, due to the draft's zoning sections. City Staff clarified that Blueprint San Diego is not a Land Use plan, but merely a framework that future Land Use plans could draw from.

Comments and concerns from the CPC included the following:

- Citing transparency, some CPC members expressed interest in seeing propensity maps utilized during the presentation in greater detail.
- Additionally, several CPC members commented that the propensity maps utilized contradicted maps which SANDAG had published on this topic.
- Gaining further insight into how certain maps and figures which were presented during the presentation were created was also something that CPC members expressed interest in.
- The target growth maps should be balanced so that new zoning and subsequent growth under Blueprint San Diego will be distributed equally both north and south of Interstate 8.
- There should be a greater diversity of public spaces included in Blueprint San Diego, beyond only parks and plazas.

- Land value increases due to zoning modifications would provide limited to benefits for residents unless certain measures would be included in Blueprint San Diego.
- Several concerns over the adequacy of existing infrastructure to support the growth goals in Blueprint San Diego were expressed by members of the CPC.
- Per some CPC members, the stated goals of Blueprint San Diego would be useful for San Diego's long-term growth. However, the methods and data that the current draft utilized seemed to be uncertain.
- The Ad-Hoc committee had previously worked with City staff on reviewing Blueprint San Diego. Through this committee, a number of documents were formed regarding Blueprint San Diego.

Motion by EA, NP, and UP to adopt the ad-hoc committee's Executive Summary, Report (plus its Level of Specificity), and have CPC approval to work with the City Planning Department on creating a document implementing the Executive Summary.

Yea: CV, EN, CH, CA, DT, EA, KT, LV, NH, NP, RB, TP, UN, UP

Nay: CM, GH, LJ, MRN, MV, OB, PEN, SR, SPH

Abstain: None.

Motion approved by vote of 14-9-0.

7. GRAND JURY REPORT

Paul Coogan of the CPC provided an update on the work the Grand Jury Ad-Hoc committee has done:

- The DSD Practices document was planned to be sent out shortly, which would include previous actions from DSD, as well as a call for better communication and stronger code enforcement from the Department.
- The Ad-Hoc committee also was looking into Land Use practices of the City of San Diego. Based upon current findings, the committee planned to submit a request for an investigation from the Grand Jury.
- Further updates will be provided in May's CPC meeting.

8. REPORTS TO CPC:

- **City Staff Report:** City staff announced that Planning Group Recognition would be heard by City Council on May 21.

Additionally, in compliance with Council Policy requirements, community planning group training will be held in June through a virtual platform.

- **Chair Report:** Chair Schlageter reminded CPC members to submit reimbursement requests to the City for planning group expenses. The Chair requested each CPC member to also CC her in correspondence with the City

regarding reimbursements to keep track of reimbursement progress and to gauge whether there are any further budget needs for each CPG.

- **CPC Member Comments:** CPC members wanted clarification on whether members could vote in virtual planning group meetings under upcoming Council Policy amendments. Per City staff's insights, planning group members would be allowed to vote on meeting action items as of the time of the April 2024 CPC meeting, policy permitting.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: May 28, 2024

Meeting was adjourned at 8:39 P.M. to next regular meeting on May 28, 2024.

DRAFT