

# Community Planners Committee

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

## **APPROVED MEETING MINUTES FOR MEETING OF TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2025**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jeff Heden, Carmel Valley (CV)  
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)  
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)  
Brian Schwab, Greater Golden Hill (GGH)  
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)  
Felicity Senoski, Linda Vista (LV)  
Bo Gibbons, Mira Mesa (MM)  
Larry Webb, Mission Beach (MB)  
Joseph Tinglof (MV)  
Representative, Navajo (NAV)  
Paul Coogan, Normal Heights (NH)  
Lynn Elliott, North Park (NP)

Andrea Schlageter, Chair, Ocean Beach (OB)  
Marcella Bothwell, Pacific Beach (PB)  
Korla Eaquina, Peninsula (PEN)  
Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)  
Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos (RPQ)  
Victoria LaBruzzo, Scripps Ranch (SR)  
Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)  
Jasmin Malin, Southeastern SD (SE)  
Chris Shamoon, Tierrasanta (TS)  
Liz, Shopes, Torrey Pines (TP)  
Chris Nielsen, University (UNIV)

### **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, CLMT, KM, LJ, MWPH, OT, OMN, SP/LH 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:

- Issues raised with alleged Council Policy 600-24, Brown Act and Roberts Rules of Order violations related to the Skyline-Paradise Hills Community Planning group.

#### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 25, 2025.**

Motion to approve March 25, 2025 minutes. Motion made by NP. Second by DT.

Yea: CV, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LV, MM, MV, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PB, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SE, TP and

UNIV.

Nay: None

Abstain: PEN

**Motion approved:** 20-0-1.

**4. ULI WORKSHOP (INFORMATION ITEM)**

Chris Clark, Executive Director and Tatiana Perez, Manager of Programs from the Urban Land Institute provided a presentation inviting all planning group members to participate in Urban Plan - a mock developer activity targeted for July 19 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. with a deadline to sign up by June 6. A brief overview was provided along with potential dates and online interest form.

**5. APPOINTMENT OF NOMINATION COMMITTEE (ACTION ITEM)**

Chair Schlageter, who will not be continuing as chair will solicit nominations for the executive board members (Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary) 2 weeks before the May meeting and provide names of nominees thereafter.

**6. TRASH FEE (INFORMATION ITEM)**

Nathan Homer, Senior Management Analyst from the Environmental Services Department presented on the trash collection fee for single-family homes.

Comments from the public and CPC members included:

- Clarification that late or unpaid fees will be reflected on your property tax bill, which could set a precedent for service fees being attached to your property and affecting escrow payments and assessments negatively. There should be a way to pay the City directly without an admin fee going to the County.
- That it could be a better deal if a private contract handled trash collection services like other jurisdictions to save residents money.
- Questions about why RFID tracking is being included in trash bins and whether it is used to track the contents in the trash bins.
- Concerns expressed over replacing old trash bins which are in perfect working order which will cost millions of dollars and whether they could be kept until they really need to be replaced.
- Whether there is any revenue generated from methane collection at the Miramar Landfill and if it was considered to reduce fees, operations, costs, etc. associated with trash collection fee program.
- Concerns about wrong information being factored in costing out the program and that this could be misleading since the prices are higher than projected.
- The benchmarking study doesn't appear to consider comparative services in the market both in the public and private sector.
- More education is encouraged about how we use the new trash bins and what goes into each bin.

## 7. ADU BONUS PROGRAM (ACTION ITEM)

David Moty (KT) of the Ad Hoc Committee presented their proposal for changes to the ADU Bonus Program summarizing the subcommittee's recommendations relative to the existing regulations and interpretations. The CPC's recommendations were presented in matrices relative to RS/RX and RM zones that included 3 optional proposals.

Comments from the public and the CPC included the following:

- Whether there could there be a consideration for property owners to process a rezone to allow more units on site as well as to allow for commercialization of lots
- Making sure adequate setbacks are included, restricting buildings to two stories, getting a moratorium in place, getting rid of the SDA.
- Comments were expressed that it's premature to bring these changes to the Planning Commission where there should be public workshops and that staff should be bringing the actual code language to CPC to be considered.
- Concerns about conflicts with new fire regulations relative to very high fire zones.
- Need for parking, lack of infrastructure, and are still standing issues.
- Written comments were submitted by Jeff Heden of the Carmel Valley planning group regarding the ADU Bonus program from their April 24, 2025 meeting and were requested to be included as an attachments to the minutes.
- Support for one bonus affordable unit, 55-year affordability deed restriction, opportunity zone configuration, the prohibition of vacation rentals, and parking requirement.
- Not everyone can live in San Diego or in California and that there is plenty of land in the country to live. The City shouldn't be obligated to provide housing.
- General support from CPC members and appreciation for the time and effort spent by the Ad Hoc Committee's work.
- Concern over a potential zoning inconsistency related to the applicability of ADU density bonus in areas zoned RM, when they are neighborhoods with single-family homes.

**Motion #1:** Approve all recommendations in Ad Hoc Committee's RS/RX Zoning Proposal matrix. Motion made by LV. Second by UNIV.

Yea: DT, EA, GGH, KT, LV, MM, MB, MV, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PB, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SE, TS, TP and UNIV.

Nay: CV and PEN.

Abstain: None.

**Motion Approved:** 21-2-0

**Motion #2:** Approve all recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee's RM Zoning Proposal matrix along with Proposal #3 for handling bonus ADUs on RM Zones: Allow 2 City Bonus

Affordable ADUs on every RM lot if allowed by the FAR. Excluded from the City Bonus Affordable ADU program would be lots which have maxed out, or even over-built their unit density allowance. These lots, along with all others will still allow State ADUs, up to 8. Motion made by MB. Second by CV.

Yea: CV, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LV, MM, MB, MV, NAV, NH, NP, OB, PEN, PB, RB, RPQ, SR, SE, TS, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: PEN and SPH

**Motion Approved:** 21-2-0

## **REPORTS TO CPC**

- **Staff Report** – Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator from the City Planning Department provide monthly updates to the CPC on citywide initiatives and reminded the CPC members that the next Planning Group Annual Training will be Thursday, May 29, 2025 from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Zoom. An alternative training will be available for those who cannot attend on the May 29. Chairs were asked to forward their current rosters to [SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov](mailto:SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov) so that invitations to the training can be directly sent to members.
- **Chair's Report** – None.
- **CPC Members' Reports** – None.

## **ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M. to next regular meeting: May 27, 2025.

Recording of the meeting can be found at following link: [CPC April 22 2025](#)

Comments by Carmel Valley CPG Representative to CPC, Jeff Heden, April 22, 2025:

As those of us up in North City, Carmel Valley and Pacific Highlands Ranch observed the outrage associated with Claremont Mesa's Shoshoni Avenue Bonus ADU mess and lawsuit, which resulted in the construction of 12 dwelling units on a single family lot via the City's infamous Bonus Program, we came to the conclusion that allowing that many extra, unplanned units, albeit "potentially now allowed" units, on an established, formally planned single family lot is beyond reason and any form of logic. No parking was provided for the additional 11 units and no city apology either. All trained urban planners are surly upset about this as it does not reflect planning in any sense of the word. I also can only imagine how difficult or impossible it would be for emergency vehicles, including ambulances and fire truck to access their way past double parked cars and trucks on a cul-de-sac

As Carmel Valley Planning Group's representative I stand against this ill-conceived Developer Freebie Bonus Program within all SF Zones

We are willing to generally support the State's ADU Program, comprised of one detached or one shared-wall ADU in the backyard of the host's unit, plus one ADU or JADU constructed within the confines of the existing SF unit walls. If the City staff is recommending that we just align with existing State ADU requirements, and not allow bonus ADU's within any single family neighborhoods, then our Carmel Valley Planning Group would support that change to the City's program. We also agree that everyone should pay a fee per unit to go towards infrastructure and that includes a San Diego-based cost-of-living adjustment.

One reserved on-site parking spot for the any ADU located outside of the TPA. Why are we allowing ADUs to have vehicles if they do not need to provide parking when located inside the TPA?

No Bonus ADUs in High and VH Fire zones, including streets and cul-de-sacs.

All ADUs to have matching (with Host SF unit) roof pitch and materials of construction.

Minimum setbacks of 5-0 for firefighting.

Separate water, gas, CATV, internet, electric meters and sewer lateral for all ADUs since ownership is down the road and apartment buildings and condo units can't all be wrong.

All ADUs and JADUs, including Bonus ADUs, shall be required to join same HOA as sponsoring SF unit and pay assessments for common space maintenance. The Host SF unit proposing an ADU shall have to apply to and be approved for construction by their HOA Architectural Committee just like SF home additions are.

The allowance of ADUs and JADUs within a zoned SF and master-planned neighborhood without the non-payment of DIFs is simply irresponsible, incomprehensible, irresponsible and illegal. Such a situation clearly overwhelms the city's current and planned infrastructure, parking, police and fire protection, and their ability to maintain the budget required to support their new unfunded growth. New development must always pay their way, and not just change the rules to require the actual, current single family owners to pay the ADU's impact fees.

The market determines where, when and how many ADUs get constructed, just like where grocery stores and restaurants get built and operated. Stacking the deck against such already carefully zoned, marginally protected and infrastructure-capable SF neighborhoods will comprise their quality of life, lower their property values and further threaten their personal safety by diluting the city's ability to protect us from crime and wildfires.

This Developer Bonus ADU program will soon be pitting neighbor against neighbor, and we'll all witness a sharp reduction in property values and an increased exodus from the great city we once knew as San Diego. The group that caused all of this will not live

here anymore, but will have made their way on the backs of us, onto higher-paying jobs  
Sacramento, and perhaps in Washington DC.