

Community Planners Committee

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

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, MARCH. 25, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Heden, Carmel Valley (CV)	Marcella Bothwell, Pacific Beach (PB)
Andrea Hetheru, Chollas Valley (CVE)	Korla Eaquina, Peninsula (PEN)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)	Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos (RPQ)
Brian Schwab, Greater Golden Hill (GGH)	Victoria LaBruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)	Cristhian Fuentes Hernandez, San Ysidro (SY)
Felicity Senoski, Linda Vista (LV)	Cat Stempel, Serra Mesa (SM)
Bo Gibbons, Mira Mesa (MM)	Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
Larry Webb, Mission Beach (MB)	Chris Shamoon, Tierrasanta (TS)
Representative, Navajo (NAV)	Liz, Shopes, Torrey Pines (TP)
Paul Coogan, Normal Heights (NH)	Chris Nielsen, University (UNIV)
Lynn Elliott, North Park (NP)	Victoria LaBruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)	

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS:

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, KM, LJ, MWPH, MB, OT, OMN, SP/LH, SE and TH.

AGENDA ITEMS:

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

Chair Schlageter called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. upon reaching quorum and conducted roll call was conducted.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT.

Non-agenda public comment included:

- A request to add items to the CPC agenda related to clarifying language in Council Policy 600-24 about the use of “bylaws” and “operating procedures, and clarifying election procedures.

- Information regarding a webinar related to understanding the housing supply and investment problem is posted on the Neighborhoods for a Better California website.
- Fire safety maps have updated on the City's website.
- Moving communication online, like the Land Development Code and the Street Design Manual disenfranchises a lot of people in the City – hardcopies need to be provided to everyone single person in the City.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JAN. 28 and FEB. 28, 2025.

Motion to approve Jan. 28, 2025 minutes. Motion made by SR. Second by NP.

Yea: CVE, DT, EA, KT, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PB, PN, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None

Abstain: CV, MB, SY and UP

Motion approved: 18-0-4

Motion to approve Feb. 25, 2025 minutes. Motion made by NP. Second by UNIV.

Yea: CV, DT, EA, KT, LV, MB, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PB, PN, RB, SY, SR, SPH, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: CVE, MM, RPQ and UP.

Motion approved: 18-0-4

4. ADU BONUS PROGRAM (ACTION ITEM)

Heidi Vonblum, Director of the City Planning Department issued a memo detailing possible changes to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Density Bonus program. The CPC reviewed the memo, discussed the issue and made initial recommendations. Chair Schlageter went over the options proposed by the City and the updated timeline.

Comments from the public and the CPC included the following:

- The proposed changes from the City will not be effective. There should be no ADU's with single-family homes.
- Proposal to eliminate the ADU density bonus in certain RS zones would have a minimum impact.
- Housing Element decertification not a real concern - removal of bonus program in RS zones would leave RM and other zones left to fulfill Housing Element obligations.
- Concerns with setbacks, traffic generation, lack of infrastructure and issues egress/emergency access especially with narrow streets and in areas within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.
- There needs to be a parking requirement to address ADUs otherwise residents would not have anywhere to park.

- The ADU Density Bonus program doesn't help affordability – a deed restriction of 15 years is not enough, and it only benefits outside investors and speculators.
- Concerns were expressed about who would opt-in to pay DIF fees for ADUs, if there is enough water supply and if transit is adequate.
- The original idea for ADUs was so you can save up to buy a new house which is no longer the case.
- Difficult to keep ADUs from RM zones since they are your duplex zones, but the effort to remove them in RS zones should be continued.
- It was mentioned that the Building Industry Associations refers to ADU builders as “freelancers” that are in the business to make a quick profit and not adding to the housing stock, creating friction for a lot of legitimate housing builders.
- The State Assembly, Senate and Governor need to be reminded that it's not the government's job to provide housing and do charity work.
- There is support for the City's efforts to revise the program, but infrastructure needs to be addressed. Impacts need to be offset by developers. ADUs need to be in scale with the surrounding community. Parking is needed despite Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) as they can change.
- Regarding the use of TPAs relative to ADUs there needs not only be a clear pedestrian path of travel, but it needs to also be ADA compliant (Americans with Disabilities Act). Also, affordable ADUs have been concentrated in low and moderate resource areas and need to be prioritized in high and highest resource areas (despite high land values) to not concentrate poverty.
- Although the State's definition of a TPA being ½ mile from a major transit stop is shorter, it's still too far individuals. State officials need to be contacted about the communities' concerns and consider overhauling the whole ADU program.
- Planning groups need to review ADU projects and see if they fit in their community.
- A study needs to be done between what's required by the State and what the City can actually so that we can rework the program and focus on aspects of the regulations that we want.
- Development Impact Fee (DIF) generated from ADUs should stay in the community where they are built.
- ADUs are a valuable source of housing in the City and a better option than a high-rise development along a canyon. The City should be commended for making revisiting and making changes to the program.
- Narrower focus is on density bonus aspect of the ADU program letter didn't address equity issue and why not all RS zones are being considered.
- Revisions to the program need to address equity and why all RS zones are not excluded for the density bonus program.

Issues summarized by the Chair to include in a letter to the City involved the following:

- There should be a longer deed restriction for affordable units like 55 years.

- No ADUs smaller than 750 sf should be allowed, so that DIF can be collected which would also limit smaller "boxy" ADUs. Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs) like those above a garage could be allowed under 750 sf.
- FAR is calculated on developable portion of lots.
- ADUs should not be used for short-term vacation rentals as they don't contribute to the housing stock.
- ADUs should be allowed to be for-sale to allow for starter homes.
- Parking should accommodate the demand.
- There should be a limit/restriction on ADUs based on the different conditions in each community (Some communities have a more extensive transit network or are denser than others)
- ADUs should be reviewed by the community.

No vote was taken on the matter only direction from the Chair to form an ad-hoc subcommittee to continue the discussion on the ADU Density Bonus Program and report back to the CPC in a month with initial recommendations to be considered for the CPC recommendation at the April meeting. CPC members included in the subcommittee: LV, PB, CV, SR, KT, SY, PEN, UNIV and CVE.

REPORTS TO CPC

- **Staff Report** – Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator from the City Planning Department provided a preview presentation on the Preservation in Progress initiative which is a comprehensive update to the City's Heritage Preservation Program. This initiative will streamline approval processes for new homes and other uses while safeguarding historic, architectural, and cultural landmarks and promoting their adaptive reuse. Members from the project team will present at CPC at a future date to provide more details and status on the initiative. Staff also provided an update on the several citywide initiatives as well as changes to the Transportation Department's service request process.
- **Chair's Report** – Chair Schlageter announced that on next month's agenda the CPC will see the Street Design Manual, citywide trash collection fee and ADU Density Bonus. The CPC will need to form an election committee for new CPC officers. Chair Schlageter mentioned that she would not running for Chair after 3 years.
- **CPC Members' Reports** – Members thanked Chair Schlageter for her service on the CPC.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

Meeting was adjourned at 7:55 P.M. to next regular meeting: April 22, 2025.

Recording of the meeting can be found at following link: [CPC March 2025](#)