

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego
1010 Second Ave., Suite 1200, East Tower • San Diego, CA 92101
SDPlanninggroups@sandiego.gov • (619) 235-5200

CPC DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Russ Connelly, City Heights	Daniel Smith, Navajo
Naveen Waney, Clairemont Mesa	Jim Baross, Normal Heights
Rhea Kulman, College Area	John Ambert, Ocean Beach
Pat Stark, Downtown	Jon Linney, Peninsula
Kenneth Malbrough, Encanto	Wallace Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch
David Swarens, Greater Golden Hill	Guy Preuss, Skyline/Paradise Hills
David Moty, Kensington/Talmadge	Robert Leif, Southeastern
Jeffrey L. Stevens, Mira Mesa	Leo Wilson, Uptown
Debbie Watkins, Mission Beach	Cathy Kenton, Midway
Janay Kruger, University	Laura Riebau, Eastern Area
Victoria Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo	Henish Pulickal, Pacific Beach
John Nugent, Mission Valley	Jon Becker, Rancho Penasquitos
	Dennis Campbell, North Park

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: Rancho Bernardo

Guests: Sandra K. Wetzel-Smith, Ray Bernal, Dennis Campbell, Tom Mullaney, and others

City Staff/Representatives: Alyssa Muto, Brian Schoenfisch, Tony Kempton, and Alfonso Gastelum. .

NOTE: *The sign-in sheets provided at the entrance to the meeting are used to list CPC Representatives, guest speakers, and staff present at the meeting.*

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair David Moty called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and proceeded with roll call.
2. **NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

3. MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

No modifications proposed. Agenda approved by unanimous consent.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2017:

Wallace Wulfeck submitted correction for Item 6 on March minutes regarding certain training that new cpg members received at COW – to change ‘undesirable’ to ‘not appropriate’ or ‘of insufficient quality.’ Leo Wilson, Uptown, moved to approve minutes as corrected. Seconded by Jose Reynoso, College Area. Motion passed 11-0-10. Abstentions: Clairemont, Eastern Area. Rancho Bernardo, Kensington/Talmadge, Rancho Penasquitos, College Area, Midway, Mission Valley, Pacific Beach, Midway, University.

5. CIP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS- Information Item

Marnell Gibson, Deputy Director of Public Works presented a Powerpoint covering the Capital Improvement Project prioritization process for Community Planning Groups. Discussion included a definition of what a CIP project is, overview of CIP FY2018-22 and outlook, roles and responsibilities of CPC, cpg and City, an anticipated CIP schedule, status of previous list of CIP requests, key CIP resources, other staff (Richard) then discussed the draft survey followed by a question and answer period.

Ms. Gibson described the CIP as a long range plan of capital needs including construction projects, planned improvements of existing facilities and identified funding sources. Identification of projects starts in fall each year and extends five years with a one year annual budget approval process. A CIP does not include operation and maintenance activities. Assets include storm water, water quality, permanent best management practices, airports, libraries, wastewater facilities, roadways, street lights, signals, road diets, bike paths, park and recreation facilities, buildings/structures. Wastewater and water facilities comprise the largest asset component and are enterprise funded. Recent capital outlook takes financial management’s projected revenue for the next five years and aligns that with all the asset management department’s identified capital needs and then determines if there is a funding gap. Public Works focuses on the funding aspect of CIP. Six hundred million dollars of revenue per year are projected to be available for the next five years, translating into the largest CIP budget that Public Works has delivered. Regarding roles and responsibilities, Public Works requests that the planning groups do outreach within jurisdictional boundaries to obtain input as to what their capital needs are, then submit their list to CPC for compilation and return to the City. Public Works takes that data and parses it out to the asset management department for consideration for future year CIP budgets. A survey will be available shortly for the planning groups to use in identifying needs and CIP training on how to use the survey will be available. The cpg’s will take June and July to identify needs and submit to CPC in August, which is then forwarded to Public Works in September. The data will then be included in the five year plan in October. The list is then rolled into the Mayor’s budget in April. Status from the previous CIP lists will be available in an Excel file for review. Projects that were on the previous list but not addressed should be included in the new format, if the cpg still wishes them to be addressed. The CIP website has information on active CIP projects and which phase, five-year outlook is also available.

Richard said that cpg input on CIP projects will be gathered on-line for the survey and that exact location will be requested, either by address or GPS coordinates, due to volume of previous requests. Information regarding whether a project is new or existing should be included in the survey. There are several categories of CIP including public safety (fire stations, police stations, etc.), community facilities (i.e. parks, libraries), drainage and storm water, mobility (roads, bike paths, etc.), and utilities. Prospective CIP projects should be reviewed to verify if they are included in the current community plan. If a prospective project is in the Facilities Financing plan the project number should be referenced. A description of the major deficiency is also requested (flooding, traffic congestion, etc.) is also requested. Optional categories provide opportunity to list additional information. And information regarding degree of project urgency is also requested to aid in prioritization (grant deadline, etc.). Contact information for cpg also requested.

Roundtable discussion:

Questions about project location as related to neighborhood/community name were raised. For example community plan neighborhood could differ from a community plan area or a police neighborhood name. The chair advised asking City staff for direction. Requests for non-City projects, (i.e. mass transit facility), could still be requested as joint agency projects if the 'other' box is checked on the form regarding project category with additional information in the description. There was some confusion expressed by members about the process of identifying what projects to list on the survey and what information could be accessed from the five-year plan. Questions regarding access to previous CIP lists pertain only to past projects. Individual project information is not available on the five-year plan but is available in the proposed budget. This five year plan would re-create the list generated by CPC in 2013 updated to reflect the latest priorities of each community. The survey is designed to determine what a cpg would like to list as a project regardless of any funding source, whether identified in a Facilities Financing plan, DIF or not. The survey is designed to reflect the latest desires of each community through their own prioritization process, and then through CPC's prioritization process. Public Works conducts a final prioritization (1-5) of the projects from the information regarding project urgency in the survey in conjunction with identifying funding sources. Identification of city-owned assets was discussed as part of an inventory of CIP's. CIP projects can have many funding sources, including DIF, enterprise funds, Transnet, grants, FBA, etc. Evaluation of CIP's will include sustainability criteria. CPC members sought guidance on how to discriminate between what were operations and maintenance (O & M) projects and what were CIP's. PW staff responded that, for example, a replacement of a storm drain would be a CIP, as it is not mere maintenance, plus the project is 'capitalized' as part of the City's inventory. Street trees are not CIP's by themselves though, if part of a larger project would be.

6. ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS- Action Item

Edith Gutierrez, Development Project Manager, Policy & Ordinance Development, Planning Department presented a Powerpoint covering a proposed amendment to companion unit regulations. She described how California's housing shortage is due to population growth and the median price of a house in San Diego being over \$500K. Housing cost also contributes to long commutes and environmental impacts. Companion

units (CU's) provide low cost housing, income to home owners, are environmentally friendly, use less utilities and construction materials and provide flexibility to changing households, such as small families, elderly and college students. Governor Brown signed three bills to encourage CU's. One bill is for Junior Units (JU's), which the City of San Diego has the option of adopting. CU's cannot exceed 50% of habitable area of the primary residence or 1200 sf for detached units. No additional parking is required if the CU is located within one half mile of transit or an architecturally significant or historic district, or part of an existing or accessory structure. To address affordable housing the Mayor has proposed additional incentives to encourage CU's including: neither the primary residence nor the CU are required to be owner occupied, existing CU height limit will be removed, one-story CU's may encroach into side and rear yard setbacks for up to 30 feet. Also, no parking required if CU is 500 sf or less, or within a transit area/bike share area. Parking requirement was reduced from 1 to .5 spaces per bedroom. As the City has adopted the JU category in compliance with AB 2406, JU's were also discussed. Unlike CU's JU's are pre-existing and don't require a discretionary permit. On March 8 of 2017 the Code Monitoring Team (CMT) voted to approve changes to the Municipal Code regarding CU's and JU's, including a requirement that both require a 30-day rental period. But the CMT was split on this issue and the state requirement (AB 2046) that the units be owner-occupied. On March 8, 2017 the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) voted to approve the CMT recommendation. Two handouts were distributed describing the current Companion Unit regulations and the new draft regulations.

Roundtable discussion:

Tom Mullaney said accessory units take away private open space and this can negatively impact higher density neighborhoods and create even more need for park space. Also, congestion related to increased parking could be a problem that would require mitigation. Guy Preuss said that the City was unnecessarily liberalizing the new regulation. Ms. Kuhlman expressed support for the state assembly bill requirement that the primary unit be owner-occupied, as for JU's, but Ms. Gutierrez said the upcoming short-term rental regulation vote at City Council may change the owner-occupied requirement for all CU's. Currently, if a property is sold the original agreement with the City regarding owner occupancy of either main residence or CU remains in effect. If a structure has used the allowable FAR for the property a CU would not be allowed. Ms. Kuhlman said this should be clarified in the modifications and also that the five foot side setback should emphasize "no less than five feet" due to noise considerations. Also, if a garage is converted to CU current regulations call only for added parking, not a new garage, which has resulted in blight in the College Area and should be addressed in the new regulations. The issue of how CU's could affect facilities was raised. Much of the ensuing commentary focused on clarification of incentives and the issue of how short-term rentals are negatively impacting some communities and what can be added to these new accessory unit regulations to address the problems associated with short-term rentals and owner-occupied units.

Ms. Kuhlman of College Area made motion to support proposed ordinance with modifications, including maximum unit size, how FAR applies, number bedrooms not exceed current standards, garage conversions include enclosed replacement parking, transit priority language be changed to reflect state mandate of within one-half mile of transit, units

with five or more bedrooms not be subject to exemptions for parking, CU's be owner-occupied, thirty day minimum rental. Seconded by Leo Wilson, Uptown. David Swarens made a friendly amendment to not include the exclusion of multi-family zones in the motion. David Moty made a friendly motion that multi. Motion passed 18-4-1. Kensington-Talmadge abstaining.

7. AFFORDABLE & SUSTAINABLE EXPEDITE PROGRAM – Action Item

Edith Gutierrez presented proposals to amend Affordable Housing Infill Projects and Sustainable Building Regulations of the Municipal Code. Specifically, Chapter 12, Divisions 4, 5, and Chapter 14, Division 9 are to be amended to incorporate the Climate Action Plan, change the program from a Process 4, Site Development Permit to a Process 2, Neighborhood Development Permit, expand eligibility within the San Diego Promise Zone, CPIOZ area and Transit Priority Areas, and define 'Sustainable Development.' Staff worked with CMT, who recommended three revisions including: definition of San Diego Promise Zone, definition of Transit Priority Area, specifying a discretionary process – Neighborhood Development Permit; adding a 55 year (Housing Commission) requirement; definition of San Diego Promise Zone added to Chapter 11; inclusion of 3 and 4 in infill; removal of Tier 1 requirements for Sustainable Building Regulations. Also, findings were modified to conform to a Neighborhood Development Permit, from the more restrictive Site Development Permit. These revisions will go to CMT in May for their vote.

Roundtable discussion:

There was general concern that a change from Process 4 to 2 would remove the public hearing aspect of the proposal, which many felt was necessary to review these projects in depth and this aspect was weighed against the benefit of streamlining the process. The following discussion identified specific concerns. Tom Mullaney said that Process 2 is inadequate for projects of this nature. Tom recommended a Process 3 because it involves a public hearing. Lara Riebau agreed with Tom's recommendation. She said these projects are going into park deficient communities creating even more need. Guy Preuss agreed it should be Process 3. Ms. Gutierrez interjected that, though there is no public hearing for a Process 2 decision, they do go to the planning groups for a vote. She also said many of these projects will involve features that will move them into a Process 4 decision anyway, so discretionary review would still come into the process. Jeffrey Stevens asked for clarification on where this might apply. Ms. Gutierrez replied that if a project met all requirements for Sustainable it would qualify as a Process 2. Leo Wilson said Uptown's concern was that a project for 50 units could have only 2 affordable and qualify for the Expedite process and that such an approval would be at staff level. He advocated a public hearing at a Process 3 in agreement with Tom Mullaney. Robert Leif agreed with Process 3 level. David Swarens said that more funds should be made available to enable a quicker turnaround for Affordable projects. Russ Connelly supported a Process 3 decision. John Ambert said that definitions were called for in the Municipal Code where Affordable and Sustainable buildings were discussed. He also called for actual methods of measuring energy consumption to substantiate claims about project Sustainability (i.e. 50% annual energy savings from solar panels) are made, not just a consultant statement. This is necessary to comply with the Climate Action Plan. He further recommended Process 3.

Debbie Watkins asked for clarification regarding the number of units for Affordable Expedite. Ms. Gutierrez thought it might be 5 or more units. Ms. Kuhlman recommended a Process 3 decision for Affordable and delete Sustainable until a better definition can be made. Janay Kruger said the Process 2 was slow and also that the 10% affordable requirement encourages developers to provide affordable on-site but the process is too cumbersome. Daniel Smith said Process 2 staff were more than adequate to review the Process 2 applications. Leo Wilson motioned that Affordable/Sustainable be a Process 3 and clarify what is Sustainable. Seconded by David Swarens, Golden Hill. John Ambert introduced a friendly amendment to include 'definitions' and 'calculations' for solar generation, cross reference all bulletins in the motion. Motion passed 18-03-1. Kensington/Talmadge abstaining.

8. CPC OFFICERS ELECTION COMMITTEE

CPC Chair requested volunteers. Jeffrey Stevens volunteered.

9. REPORTS TO CPC:

- Staff Report: Brian Schoenfisch reminded CPC that the Community Orientation Workshop (COW) is May 20, 2017 in the Silver Room from 9:00 am– 12:30pm.
- Subcommittee Reports:- None
- Chairperson's Report:- None
- CPC Member Comments - None:

ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING, April 25, 2017

The meeting was adjourned by Chair David Moty at 10:11 PM