

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, DEC. 2, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT and ATTENDING VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM:

Jeff Heden, Carmel Valley (CV)	Kevin Sullivan, Navajo (NAV)
Saige Gonzalez Walding, Chollas Valley (CVE)	Lynn Elliott, North Park (NP)
Marcellus Anderson, City Heights (CH)	Emilie Colwell, Normal Heights (NH)
Matthew Wang, Clairemont (CLMT)	Marcella Bothwell, Pacific Beach (PB)
Robert Montana, College Area (CA)	Andrew Hollingworth, Peninsula (PEN)
Bob Link, Downtown (DT)	Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Laura Riebau, Eastern Area (EA)	Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos (RPQ)
David Swarens, Greater Golden Hill (GGH)	Victoria LaBruzzo, Chair, Scripps Ranch (SR)
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge (KT)	Guy Preuss, Skyline-Paradise Hills (SPH)
Lisa Kriedeman, La Jolla (LJ)	Jasmine Mallen, Southeastern, (SESD)
Felicity Senoski, Vice Chair, Linda Vista (LV)	Liz Shopes, Torrey Pines (TP)
Bo Gibbons, Mira Mesa (MM)	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, KM, MWPH, OT, OMN, SP/LH and TH.

AGENDA ITEMS:

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

Chair LaBruzzo called the meeting to order at 6:21 p.m. upon reaching quorum and conducted roll call was conducted.

A motion to add action Item #7 and #8 related to a request from the Chollas Valley Community Planning Group for support of their appeal to the Emerald Hills project and a request for the City to allow designated speaking blocks for the CPC and planning groups at public hearings.

Motion to approve the agenda and accept Action Items #7 and #8 as described as part of the modified agenda.

Yea: CV, CVE, CH, CLMT, CA, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, PB, PEN, RB, SR, SPH, RPQ, SESD, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Motion approved: 24-0-0

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT.

Non-agenda public comment included a reminder that the elections for the Eastern Area Community Planning Committee were upcoming, concerns with marking using digital billboards, an update to the College Area and Clairemont Community Plan Updates at Land Use & Housing Committee, an update on the effort to make La Jolla City, an update on the “Turquoise Tower” in Pacific Beach, a request to update Council Policy 600-24 Administrative Guidelines and the announcement of the CPC website: sdcp.org

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 28, 2025

Motion to approve as amended to include “immediately correcting District 4 maps...” made by NP. Second by PB.

Yea: CV, CVE, CH, CA, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, PB, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SESD, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: CLMT and PEN.

Motion approved: 22-0-2

4. 2025 LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE (INFO ITEM)

Marlon Pangilinan, Program Coordinator from the City Planning Department presented on the general timing on outreach and hearing, staff attendance at subcommittee meetings and the Jan. 27 CPC meeting and the availability of the 2025 LDC Update overview video that CPC members could distribute to their respective planning groups to inform their input/recommendations on the update.

Comments expressed on this matter included:

- Chair LaBruzzo recommended that in the interest of time, that CPC members take share the overview video with their respective planning groups.
- Suggestions to share any proposed amendments, that didn’t make it into the 2025 proposed amendments at hearing or to submit them as part of next years proposals.
- The proposed changes threaten both our shared heritage and the foundation of our citizen planning and review process.
- The timing on the outreach schedule was “too tight” given the holidays and may not allow enough time for planning groups for review.

- A request that state representatives provide advance information on upcoming State legislation.
- Inquiry as to why the Community Enhancement Overlay Zone (CEOZ), which is being included in community plan updates is not being discussed at CPC since it's a citywide overlay zone.

5. PACIFIC BEACH PLANNING GROUP CORRESPONDENCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT (ACTION ITEM)

Marcella Bothwell, Chair of the Pacific Beach Planning Group updated the CPC on the response from the Development Services Department (DSD) regarding that complaint letter related to the fee policy to review development project records. In September, the CPC voted to support sending a letter to DSD regarding this issue.

Comments expressed on this issue included:

- That all documents submitted to the City are considered public domain and automatically should be available to public to request and review.
- DSD's explanation appears to conflict with State law with regard to access to public records and that a CPC response letter could mention this as justification.
- Acknowledgement that architects' work is proprietary and copyrighted and that DSD operates as a "cost recovery" department, but the main concern with this issue is transparency.

Two motions separate motions were made by the CPC on this item:

Motion #1 for the CPC to write a letter to the City requesting clarification to the City's response with regard to transparency and consistency with State law made by GGH. Second by NP.

Yea: CV, CVE, CH, CA, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, PB, PEN, PB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SESD, TP and UNIV.

Nay: CLMT.

Abstain: None.

Motion approved: 23-1-0

Motion #2 to waive the \$34 notetaking fee made by CA. Second by GGH.

Yea: CVE, CH, CA, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NP, PB, PEN, RB, SR, SPH, SESD and UNIV

Nay: CV, CLMT, NH, RPQ and TP

Abstain: None.

Motion approved: 19-5-0

6. NEIGHBORHOOD HOMES FOR ALL US (INFORMATION ITEM)

Chair LaBruzzo made a request of CPC members to apply to participate in a focus group of peers to discuss topics related to initiative such as home design preferences and identifying barriers to finding homes. Volunteer members included: CA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, NAV, NP, PB, RB, TP and SPH. Chair Labruzzo mentioned that related links would be provided and included on the CPC webpage.

7. CHOLLAS VALLEY CORRESPONDENCE REQUEST (ACTION ITEM)

Saige Gonzalez Walding, Chair of the Chollas Valley Community Planning Group (CVCPG) updated the CPC on the Planning Commission hearing on the Emerald Hills project and made a request for the CPC to provide a letter in support of the CVCPG regarding an appeal of the Emerald Hills Project, located in Emerald Hills that relied on Footnote 7 and numerous waivers and included conflicts with the General Plan and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) concerns.

NH recused from discussion of this item.

Comments expressed on this issue included overall support for the CVCPG’s appeal of the Emerald Hills project.

Motion for the CPC to provide a letter of support if CVCPG’s right to appeal to the City Council made by PB. Second by KT.

Yea: CV, CVE, CH, CA, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NP, PB, PEN, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SESD, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: DT

Motion approved: 21-0-1 with NH recused.

8. REQUEST: CITY TO PROVIDE CPC & CPGS SPEAKING BLOCKS AT CITY OPEN MEETINGS (ACTION ITEM)

Chair La Bruzzo explained the request to as part of the City’s official recognition of community planning groups, that dedicated speaking blocks be dedicated to planning groups at Planning Commission, Land Use & Housing Committee, City Council and other open meetings. Currently, organized presentations require multiple individuals ceding time during public comment. This request serves to designate particular consideration (e.g., speaking time and/or request for clarifications) for recognized planning groups.

Comments expressed on this issue included:

- The need for equal considerations for speaking time afforded to both applicant and the planning group.

- A need to dialogue with the applicant, similar to how Planning Commission seeks clarifications with an applicant.
- Staff presentation are essentially the “applicant’s powerpoint” and don’t focus on the problems only positive aspects of the project.

Motion to table this item indefinitely (not time certain) made by CA. Second by NP.

Yea: CV, CVE, CH, CA, DT, EA, GGH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, NAV, NH, NP, PB. PEN, RB, RPQ, SR, SPH, SESD, TP and UNIV.

Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Motion approved: 23-0-0.

REPORTS TO CPC

- **Staff Report** – None.

- **Chair’s /CPC Member Reports** – None.

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

Meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M. to next regular meeting: Tuesday, January 27, 2026.