

**College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB) and College Area Community Council (CACC)  
Minutes from the Regular Meetings: July 8, 2020, 7:00 pm  
Held via Zoom Conference Call**

P	Jose Reynoso	President	P	Andrew Gade
P	Jim Jennings	Vice President	P	Robert Higdon
P	Ann Cottrell	Secretary	P	Tom Hilanto
P	John Putman	Treasurer	P	Chris Luna
P	Rachel Gregg	SDSU Appointee	P	Robert Montana
L	Armando Sepulveda	SDSU AS Appointee	P(A1)	Ja'Mar Montgomery
A2	Jim Schneider	BID Representative	P	Troy Murphree
P	Saul Amerling		P	B.J. Nystrom
P	Ellen Bevier		P	Jerry Pollock
P(A1)	David Cook		P	Tom Silva

TOTAL BOARD MEMBERS: 20

P= present L= Late A – Absent (1),(2),(3) = 1st, 2nd 3rd absence

CP 600-24, Art. IV, Sec 1: “A vacancy exists upon the 3rd consecutive absence or 4th absence in 12 months (April May)

M/S/C = Moved/Seconded/Carried

The College Area Community Council (CACC) and the College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB) are two separate entities with a common board and officers and joint meetings. The items highlighted below with asterisks are CACPB business items, subject to City Council Policy 600-24 governing community planning groups. Items are reported in agenda outline order, although some items may have been considered in a different sequence.

**COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

**I. Call to order/pledge of allegiance: 7:00 p.m.**

VP Jennings acting as chair.

**II. Agenda approval**

*Putman*: add C in New Business, request to approve waiver of rule requiring second signature on checks over \$200 during virus.

Jennings moved approval

unanimous \*Carried

**III. Approval of CACC June 10, 2020 minutes**

Jennings moved approval

Y:17 N:0 A:1 (Montgomery absent) \*Carried

**IV. Public Comments on Non-Agenda items in the Jurisdiction of the College Area Community Council**

None

**V. Law Enforcement, elected officials, BID, SDSU & AS**

*A. Matthew Gordon, State Rep Gloria's office*

1. Report on State Budget as impacted by Covid 19.

2. *Jennings*: What is Gloria's stand on Faulconer's Complete Communities Proposal. A: I don't know.

3. *Reynoso*: Who do we contact about housing bills? A: Assembly is not in session so I don't know when they will be considered

*B. Sanna Loando, Council District 9.*

1. Council votes: a) extend eviction moratorium b) approve ballot measure on Independent Police Commission c) approve ballot measure on district elections for school board members.
2. Tubman Joint Use Park will open shortly; SDUSD has done final inspection.
3. Storm sewer work on Reservoir Dr. will be finished by the end of July.
4. Our office will shepherd proposal to eliminate parking on Montezuma between Campanile & 55<sup>th</sup>.
5. *Pollock*: Any progress on addressing crime on Yerba Anita & College Gardens Ct.?  
A. We have not heard of any more cases & have requested extra patrols.

*C. Rachel Gregg, SDSU*

1. Fall Preparations are being made for mainly on-line classes. CSU is working on response to Trump's order that international students may not remain in U.S. unless taking classes in person.
2. Mission Valley site for SDSU West is in escrow.

*D. Melissa Link, SDSUPD* Nothing unusual to report.

*E. Armando Sepulveda, Associated Students*

1. We are working with international students to deal with recent order just mentioned.
2. We are looking into slow reopening for AS facilities, e.g. ARC, Campus Children's center. No decisions yet

**VI. President's Report:** *Reynoso*

CPC chair will do a press release on response to Complete Communities Proposal. I'll send it to all.

**VII. New Business**

*A. Discussion regarding payment of \$900 to Faith Presbyterian Church for rooms used in 2019-20:*

M to pay Faith Presbyterian \$900: Jennings S: Cottrell Y: 19 N: 0 A: 0 \*Carried

*B. Proposal to cancel August 2020 CACC meeting.*

Jennings moved approval unanimous \*Carried

*C. Proposal to suspend requirement of second signature on checks over \$200 for 9 months due to virus.*

M: Putman S: Amerling

*Putman*: This is CACC, not a bank, requirement. I will ask permission from Reynoso when doing this so there is a written record

*Cook*: Amend to waive 2<sup>nd</sup> signature on checks up to \$1,000

*Putman, Amerling*: Accepted Y: 19 N: 0 A: 0 \*Carried

**VIII. Treasurer's Report:** *Putman*

1. I sent the report to everyone. June balance for the CACCouncil budget balance is \$17,227.32
2. There is no income because all income goes to the CACCcoalition account; we must leave \$ 1,500 in it.
3. The Coalition Board must approve transfers to Council account; the board will set up rules for this.

**IX. Committee Reports:**

*A. Community Outreach: Amerling*

We're doing a mid-year membership drive. A letter will be sent to anyone who has been a member but has not renewed recently & another to people who have bought homes in the area in the past 3years.

**X. Delegate Reports:** None

**XI. Adjournment:** 7:50 p.m.

**COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD**

**I. Call to order:** 7:50 p.m.

**II. Approval of Agenda:**

Jennings moved approval

unanimous \*Carried

### III. Approval of minutes of special CACPB meeting June 17, 2020:

Jennings moved approval

Y:14 N:0 A:5 (Cottrell, Cook, Montgomery, Murphree, Nystrom -absent)

\* Carried

### IV. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items within the Jurisdiction of the CACPB. None

### V. New Business

#### A. Approve appointment of Julie Hamilton to Community Plan Update Committee

M: Cottrell, S: Cook

Y: 19 No: 0 A:0 \*Carried

#### B. Discussion of letter of support for community proposal to rename Tubman Joint-Use Field as the Tubman/Murphree Joint-Use Field: Reynoso

Tubman Principal & district agreed to this. Then principal, fearing some parents might oppose park name suggested a bench with a plaque honoring her.

*Murphree*: That is fine, though I'd prefer a tree.

Move some kind of recognition for Murphree at the park: Cottrell, S: Montana

Y: 18 N:0 A: 1 (Pollock, Troy is too modest) \*Carried

#### C. Discussion of the proposed Complete Communities Initiative.

##### 1. Comments on the initiative *Hamilton*. (Hamilton's memo to the Board attached below)

###### a. Building component to increase density, provide more affordable housing in multifamily zone, in transit priority areas

- Size would be limited by Floor Area Ratio (FAR), no longer by lot size. Tripling the FAR permits much larger, taller projects
- Development costs & time would be reduced by: lowering development impact fees thus reducing funds for infrastructure & removing public review e.g. eliminating discretionary and CEQA reviews, & public input.

###### b. Park Master Plan component is unlikely to increase park space

- Basis for evaluating parks changes from acres of land per 1,000 residents to points for amenities so park evaluations may improve without adding any park area.

##### 2. Additional comments

###### a. *Silva*. CPC opposed the Complete Communities plan for the reasons Hamilton listed & the park plan because it doesn't show equity or how it could be achieved & removes local level review.

CPC also opposed parks plan because it doesn't add new parks

###### b. *Reynoso* CPC stressed elimination of community input.

##### 3. Move to support CPCs position on Complete communities: Reynoso, S: Nystrom

*Amerling*: we need to go farther. This message needs to come from more than just CPC. We have a community plan that accomplishes these goals but in a way we define. On the issue of community control they need to look at us as well as coastal. A letter from College Area should emphasize our concerns & what we are doing.

Move to support CPC position on initiative & send letter on our letterhead: Jennings S: Nystrom

Y: 16 N:0 A:3 (Cook, Gregg, Pollock not enough information) \*carried

Move CACPB write City Council our concerns regarding Complete Communities Initiative & call a special meeting in July to adopt it: Jennings S: Amerling

Y:19 N:0 A:0 \*carried

#### D. Proposal to cancel August 2020 meeting

M: Putman S: Gregg

Y: 19 No: 0 A:0 \*Carried

### VI. Committee Reports

#### A. Community Plan Update Committee: Montana

We met last month to talk about conservation element, not including implementation rules. At July meeting we will discuss public facilities & maybe some policies as well as draft of a community atlas city has been preparing for base line information.

**VII Adjournment 8:35 p.m.**

Minutes by Ann Cottrell, Secretary

-----

---

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

**TO:** COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY COUNCIL, COLLEGE AREA  
COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD, COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY  
PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE

**FROM:** JULIE HAMILTON

**SUBJECT:** COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

**DATE:** JULY 8, 2020

---

The Complete Communities Initiative is a program being drafted by the City of San Diego to encourage the development of more housing and focus density in the vicinity of transit and jobs. Reading the materials from the City is a challenge. The websites and links provided link to summary documents that paint a very rosy picture; but the devil is in the details. A member of the public needs to go to each element of the initiative and click on the drop-down menus. Then the public would need to read the underlying documents to get a true picture of Complete Communities as applied to the College Area.

I am offering my personal opinion on the City of San Diego's Complete Communities Initiative. This opinion is based on my review of the documents and my experience as a planner and land use/environmental attorney, I began working in San Diego as a planner for the Coastal Commission in 1979. At that time, the Coastal Commission was avidly pursuing affordable housing in the Coastal Zone. The housing crisis and need for more affordable housing is not new. There is substantial evidence YIMBYism was brought to the forefront several years ago by the tech companies in Northern California, the real estate industry and developers.

There is little doubt we need more housing in San Diego, especially affordable housing. Existing zoning in the City of San Diego can accommodate all the housing we need but the development industry states it is too expensive to build in San Diego to facilitate affordable housing. The City of San Diego is pushing forward a series of changes to the municipal code that would allow developers to build substantially larger projects, provide less open space and pay less in developer impact fees – if they provide 10% low income units and 10% moderate income units (the top limit for moderate income in San Diego is \$119,000 per household).

The concept is if they let developers build at a higher density with a lower cost the developers would be willing to build affordable housing. The other aspect of the initiative is to allow this increase in density in transit priority areas to reduce reliance on the car. There are a lot of technical aspects of the initiative; but I want to focus on what I see as most impactful to the College Area.

- Complete Communities is a tool that developers can use on lots zoned for multi-family residential in transit priority areas. In the College Area this is essentially any lot that you know now has a duplex or more on the lot (accessory dwelling units and companion units would not be an indicator of multi-family zoning).
- Should a developer decide to build under Complete Communities the following would be allowed by right (no discretionary review, no CEQA review, no opportunity for public participating).
  - Density would be determined by Floor Area Ratio (FAR) rather than lot size. A developer can build as many units on the site as desired if they stay within the FAR. The FAR for the College Area would be 8.
    - An example is the project that Keith Henderson just proposed at 63<sup>rd</sup> and Montezuma. That project was limited to a FAR of 2.7 – with Complete Communities the project could be built at three times the size with no public participation.
  - Height would also be determined by FAR. Now, the tallest height limit in the College Area is 65 feet. With a FAR of 8, the height of buildings would be at least 90 feet. (South Campus Plaza is approximately 75 feet high.)
- Developer Impact Fees:
  - DIF would be reduced by basing the amount of fees on building square footage rather than number of units. If the developer builds 100 units at 300 square feet the developer would pay less in fees than if the developer built 100 units at 800 square feet. This allows the developer to add more people to the community and pay less in fees.
  - DIF would no longer be required to be used in the community where collected. DIF would be apportioned 50% to the plan area where the project is located and 50% to communities of concern (to be determined by the City Manager aka Mayor). The only communities of concern in the College Area are Alvarado Estates and College View Estates. I have not done the research but I believe these are communities of concern due to lack of parks and distance from transit.
- Parks:
  - The Park Master Plan removes the goal of 2.8 acres of park land for every 1,000 residents and replaces it with point system that gives points based on a variety of things shown in Attachment 1. The plan switches from a population-based standard to a value-based standard. This allows smaller parks with more amenities.
  - I find the implementation of the plan quite confusing. It appears the City would attempt to increase recreational opportunities by:
    - Expanding services and amenities in existing parks
    - Repurposing right of way to provide more active transportation
    - Encouraging and incentivizing new parks where most needed
    - Increasing access to regional parks.
    - Improving underused sites and infrastructure such as parking lots, freeway underpasses and paper streets
  - Move to a City-wide park fee to allow park fees to be spent anywhere in the City based on need rather than spent in community where development is occurring.

- It is unclear to me how the park fee structure would be changed. I am not certain whether park fees continue to be based on a population-based park need or a value-based park needs.

The only benefit I see to Complete Communities is the affordable housing. The rest of it is bad for the City. The City will be allowing more density without consideration of the environmental consequences. The developer impact fees will be reduced, allowing more people on a reduced fee. The City already struggles with maintaining the infrastructure, this will exacerbate that situation. The City needs to determine how to cover infrastructure costs for this level of density.

The Park Master Plan that is a component of Complete Communities is an interesting and innovative idea. My biggest concern is the PMP will result in goals that demand less park land. I thought it was clear the residents of San Diego desire open space as has been proven with the pandemic. I like the idea of repurposing public land and adding amenities to parks, but I hate to re-prioritize the need for more park land. It is interesting to note that the newer areas north of Interstate 8 have less access to parks. The access figures show most of city south of Interstate 8 have better access to parks (except for the new areas or Otay Mesa and the Tijuana River Valley). The idea is to focus parks into the under-served communities, but those communities are not the older communities such as the College Area and City Heights. Those areas are La Jolla, Carmel Valley, Del Mar Heights, Santa Luz, Rancho Penasquitos. See Attachment 2.

It does not appear the Park Master Plan will serve the purpose it is intended to serve. The park fees will be directed to the underserved communities – not the lower-income communities with higher population densities. The City would have to weight the Climate Equity Index much heavier for the PMP to serve the lower-income communities.

In sum, although both Complete Communities and the Parks Master Plan are interesting and innovative planning documents – they need a substantial amount of revising before the College Area Community Planning Group should support these documents.

