

<b>Public Comment of 4/21/2022</b>										
<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Agenda Item Number</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comments</b>					
Fred	Gage	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item						
Kimberly	Emberton	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD determination of Substantial Conformance					
Juul	Adamek	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD determination of Substantial Conformance.					
Thomas	Bauer	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD determination of substantial conformance.					
Suzanne	Ball	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support determination of substantial conformance					
Kim	Witmer	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD Determination of substantial Conformance					
Trinka	Adamson	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item						
Martin	Hetzer	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item						
Satchidananda	Panda	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD determination of substantial conformance.					

Craig	Benedetto	4/21/2022	2	In Support of Item	<p>On behalf of NAIOP San Diego, the Commercial Real Estate Association, please consider support for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pipeline provision similar to the parks fee set at application submittal (when deemed complete) to protect projects that were submitted under previous pro forma considerations</li> <li>- Pipeline should be the same for residential and non-residential projects (residential is covered by SB 330)</li> <li>- Similar to the parks fee program, choice of which fee amount to use should be the applicants</li> <li>- Implementation date should be pushed back 1 year given processing delays and workforce issues</li> <li>- A hold harmless should be considered to avoid double hits from communities who don't like money being sent outside of community plan area and want additional applicant exactions to ensure community amenities are provided</li> <li>- Given 81% of CP areas will see a significant increase, consider offsets to fee impact, including expedited, by right approvals</li> <li>- We understand Otay Mesa is being considered for a different program, but we're not aware of it. Changes like this need open public consideration before hearing bodies are asked to approve</li> </ul> <p>We appreciate your consideration.</p>					
Matt	Adams	4/21/2022	2	In Support of Item	<p>Conditional Support based on pipeline project protections and plan implementation timeline.</p>	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-</a>				

						<a href="#">meetings/appeal a street w ct he city of san diego.pdf?s andread=d58259d1055015c4</a>				
Craig	Benedetto	4/21/2022	Item #2 - Build Better SD	In Support of Item	Members of the Commission:On behalf of NAIOP San Diego, the Commercial Real Estate Association, please consider support for the following:- Pipeline provision similar to the parks fee set at application submittal (when deemed complete) to protect projects that were submitted under previous pro forma considerations- Pipeline should be the same for residential and non-residential projects (residential is covered by SB 330)- Similar to the parks fee program, choice of which fee amount to use should be the applicants- Implementation date should be pushed back 1 year given processing delays and workforce issues- A hold harmless should be considered to avoid double hits from communities who don't like money being sent outside of community plan area and want additional applicant exactions to ensure community amenities are provided- Given 81% of CP areas will see a significant increase, consider offsets to fee impact, including expedited, by right approvals- We understand Otay Mesa is being considered for a different program, but we're not aware of it. Changes like this need open public consideration before hearing bodies are asked					

					to approveWe appreciate your consideration.					
Nathan	Elliott	4/21/2022	Item #1: Salk Institute	In Support of Item	The Salk Institute is an iconic part of San Diego's architectural history and the new addition allows them to further expand their mission in a way that respects the existing campus and the surrounding context.					
Ben	Granovsky	4/21/2022	Item #1: Salk Institute	In Support of Item	Item #1: Salk Institute					
Irwin	Jacobs	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	Please deny appeal and support DSD determination of substantial conformance.					

Clayton	Tschudy	4/20/2022	2, Build Better San Diego	In Support of Item	San Diego Canyonlands strongly supports the Build Better SD plan as a forward thinking, progressive reform supporting equitable distribution of DIF in the communities of San Diego. Please see the attached letter for our full comment. Thank you for your consideration.	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/build_better_sd_support_letter_to_planning_commission_4_20_2022.pdf?sandread=ccb6a8d1004ad4f1">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/build_better_sd_support_letter_to_planning_commission_4_20_2022.pdf?sandread=ccb6a8d1004ad4f1</a> <a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/4122_general_population_growth.pdf?sandread=d57140d105417816">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/4122_general_population_growth.pdf?sandread=d57140d105417816</a>				
Matthew	Hennessy	4/21/2022	ITEM 1 - Salk Institute SCR Project No. 687543	In Support of Item	I am in support of approval of this project and firmly believe that it will bring great value to the existing campus and community it serves.					

Charles	Kaminski	4/21/2022	Item 1 Salk Appeal	In Support of Item	<p>This appeal is straight forward. The design changes and new images clearly present an intrusive modification that definitely compromises the historic integrity and intent of the Jonas Salk/Louis Kahn original design for the site. These new proposed details, the reduced glass in the elevation and the bridge component, make clear and evident that the mitigation approved 14-years ago has been severely compromised. This design change fails to fully address the concerns expressed in 2006 &amp; 2008 that any new building must fully mitigate the loss of the significant linear and visual east-west connection of the continent to the sea and sky as envisioned by Dr. Jonas Salk and architect Louis Kahn. What was once described as limited visibility has now become invisible. Review by staff was and is inadequate and insufficient for such an important and internationally recognized historic site. These design changes and details must be reviewed by the full Historic Resources Board for conformity to the Secretary of Interior Standards. There is no other option.</p>				
Marc	Turcot	4/21/2022	"ITEM 1 - Salk Institute SCR Project No. 687543	In Support of Item	<p>The thorough, thoughtful and innovative design of this addition is in line with the iconic nature of the existing architecture. This expansion will support the institute and its team of scientists in their continued path to develop "cures" for decades to come.</p>				

Holley	Haynes	4/21/2022	1 - Salk Institute SCR Project No. 687543	In Support of Item	A positive & innovative improvement aligned with the Institute's master plan and benefiting the growth of the incredible scientific R&D at Salk.					
Danna	Givot	4/21/2022	<b>NON_A GENDA COMMENT</b>		<p>MAYOR GLORIA'S PLANNING DEPARTMENT IS KNOWINGLY USING OUTDATED 2013 SANDAG SERIES 13 PROJECTIONS FOR CURRENT COMMUNITY PLAN "UPDATES."</p> <p>Last December, SANDAG adopted Series 14 population and housing projections through 2050. Despite updated projections, the Planning Department continues to plan based on outdated, inflated data. This leads to unnecessary, harmful impacts.</p> <p>For the City, Series 14 data projects significantly slower population growth than Series 13 data.</p> <p>Series 14 projections are available by community planning area, where differences can be huge. For example, take the College Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Planning Department is using Series 13 data projecting 49,000 people in 2050, while Series 14 projects 34,000, 15,000 or 31% less people.</li> <li>• For housing, the outdated Series 13 data projects 18,000 units, while Series 14 projects under 14,000, 4000 or 24% less housing units needed in 2050.</li> <li>• Outdated projections expected</li> </ul>	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663</a>	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663</a>	<a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663">http://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663</a>	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/42122_expanded_planning Commission comments the mayors planning department is using grossly outdated 2013 sandag series 13 data as the basis for current community plan updates.pdf?sandread=5713fd105417663</a>	

12,700 children 0-19 in 2050, while current projections anticipate 8,600 children, 4000 or 32% less.

Would you budget for 2022 based on 2013 information? Of course not. A data-driven government would use the most recent information available.

Mayor Gloria's Planning Department must "update" community plans based on the most accurate projections available.

[57](#)  
[14](#)  
[2d](#)  
[10](#)  
[54](#)  
[17](#)  
[b7c](#)



Steve	Lamprides	4/21/2022	Item 5 T mobile 687321	In Opposit ion to Item	<p>The environmental document is faulty in that it is insufficient and inaccurate. The CUP for the church which will lease land to the tower proponents does not permit such activity. The Report to Planning Commission is replete with errors, including facts, mis-statements and graphical representations. Mitigations for the oversized tower are explained away with sentences like the following: "Therefore the proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan." The tower is the adversity! The proposed storage room is 3.5 times higher than that specified in the existing land use plan. Sixty-six feet height is more than twice the existing stated height limit of thirty feet. Aerial photo is not of the subject project.</p>	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/appeal_a_street_wct_he_city_of_san_diego.pdf?sandread=d58259d1055015c4">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/appeal_a_street_wct_he_city_of_san_diego.pdf?sandread=d58259d1055015c4</a>				
Brian	Pollard	4/21/2022	Build Better SD is Item #2	In Opposit ion to Item	<p>Adjusting the DIF's downwards for affordable housing in underserved communities is in no way "equitable". along with affordable housing and density comes badly needed resources that support these families. Lower DIF, equates to fewer resources. Bringing additional resources are essential as we build out. This is the reason for DIF's correct?</p>					

Brian	Kowalchuk	4/21/2022	#1 Salk		Design will contribute to both the quality of Salk and the surrounding environment. I am in full support.					
Marti	Kranzberg	4/21/2022	1 Salk	In Opposition to Item	<p>Compromising Vision of Salk ( see attached 500 word statement)</p> <p>The question is, does this Planning Commission say: Form Follows Function, so WTF, you got the money to do it –</p> <p>Gay gezunt- Go in good health!" ?</p> <p>Do you want to be the one to destroy the integrity of this space?</p> <p>Like a mustache on the Mona Lisa?</p> <p>The building solves the needs of the scientific work, but this building design comes at the expense of destroying the original intent of the architecture, and the surrounding space that is designed to inspire all who work and visit this Mecca of Scientific Inquiry. The form of this addition functions for those who applaud it, but it's like installing a 2-story-high picket fence around Stonehenge.</p> <p>You are urged to recognize excellence in design, and require that any "addition" honors and respects the creative inspiration the Salk Institute represents to all people who approach and experience this unique spot, that echoes the story of Dr. Salk and the People's "March of</p>					

					<p>Dimes" that built it.</p> <p>This sacred spot is entrusted to You.</p> <p>Salk Institution rightfully needs its expansion, but insist on maintaining visionary design that respects what is Here.</p>					
Shane	Williams	4/21/2022	#1 Salk	In Support of Item	I think this is a very important project to make the world a better place and it has my full support.					
Camille	Passon	4/21/2022	Item 1: Salk Institute SCR	In Support of Item	X	I would like to cede my speaking time to the applicant.				
Tim	Ball	4/21/2022	1	In Support of Item	X					

Kyle	Boyce	4/21/2022	Item 1: Salk Institute SCR	In Support of Item		I would like to cede my time to the applicant's presentation (Tim Ball and Lilian Asperin).				
David	Watson	4/21/2022	Salk SCR	In Support of Item	X	I strongly support the staff determination of substantial conformance. The proposed design conforms to the design originally approved by the City Council. I request you deny the appeal and approve the SCR per staff recommendation.				
Kim	Baranek	4/21/2022	Salk Institute SCR Appeal	In Support of Item		I would like to concede my time to the applicant's				

						presentati on.				
Lilian	Asperin	4/21/2 022	#1: Salk Institut e SCR	In Support of Item	X		<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/lt_to_h_eacox_04_14_22.pdf?sandread=479736bf0a783fe8">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/lt_to_h_eacox_04_14_22.pdf?sandread=479736bf0a783fe8</a>			
Michael	Pepler	4/21/2 022	Project 687321 - T- Mobile Cell Tower at 4907 A Street	In Opposit ion to Item		I reside several hundred feet down the street from the location of this proposed cell tower I oppose this project. As other cell towers of this magnitud e along the 94 corridor				

						<p>are located in business/industrial areas I don't understand how this location in an established primarily single story, single home neighborhood is even being considered. There are currently NO other trees at the height of 66 feet on the property and by planting one small tree next to it, it will in no way mitigate the fact that this a 66 foot tall cell tower in a single-story residential neighborhood. This</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

						tower should be built in an industrial area, not a residential neighborhood. I oppose this project.				
Denise	Camper-Williams	4/21/2022	687321	In Opposition to Item		Please see correspondence to Mr. Heacox and supporting documents. Thank you.	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/salk_appeal_bullet_points.pdf?sandra=93b875d9fdc16dea">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/pc-meetings/salk_appeal_bullet_points.pdf?sandra=93b875d9fdc16dea</a>			

Lisa	Mortensen	4/24/2022	Item 2	In Opposition to Item		<p>Build Better SD will take the much needed DIF funds from the areas severely impacted by the ever increasing high-density development that is taking place the needed improvement or replacement of outdated infrastructure. Our streets and sidewalks are broken, we need city services for health and safety needs. This is being taken away and will lead to further decay of our community where</p>				
------	-----------	-----------	--------	-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--



						people will more and more park on our public streets because the new construction will not offer on-site parking.If the mayor wants the 'underserved' communities to be upgraded, then he needs to either allocate from the existing general fund or encourage development in these neighborhoods so they will benefit from their own DIF.Stop the money grab, Mr. Mayor. Keep our DIF fees in our neighborhood				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

						where the need is great.Lisa Mortense n				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Charles	Kaminski	4/21/2022	Item 1 Salk Institute Appeal	In Support of Item	X	I am the appellant. In addition to the material I submitted to the Project Manager, please see attached. Additionally I would ask that staff provide the Commissioners and Public with all permits issued since 2008 under the previously approved original Project No. 44675; CDP, SDP, MPDP, MHPA Boundary Line Adjustment, VTM, and Easement Abandonment, an Amendment to CDP/HRP/CUP 90-1140. I				
---------	----------	-----------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	--

						<p>request this to verify appropriate work commenced within the specified 36-month time requirements as specified in the staff report, Attachment 6, page 2, Item 1 Standard Requirements. Staff should indicated under which original permit requests were made in the 36-month requirement including date of permit application and date work was completed. This list of work should</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

						also indicate all subsequent permits and any and all work commenced after the 36-month requirement and if any Extensions of Time were requested and approved up until the present time.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Sharon	Gehl	4/21/2022	Item #1	In Opposition to Item	X	I urge the City Planning Commission to support the Salk Institute's trustees, faculty, staff, and volunteers by denying Mr. Kaminski's the appeal, and upholding the Development Services Department decision of substantial conformance with the Salk master plan approved by the City Council in 2008. The Salk Institute needs this new Science and Technology Center				
--------	------	-----------	---------	-----------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>for their critical research space and application of emerging technologies to scientific challenges . Mr. Kaminski's main objection seems to be to the covered atrium that holds the two halves of the new building together. This atrium was approved in 2008 and improved in the recent revisions to the building design. The new building would not function as well for the thousands of people who will use it over</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

						the years with an open exposed gap in the middle of the building that would discourage connections between researchers.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--