

**College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB)**  
 Minutes from the Regular Meeting: May 11, 2022 at 7:00 pm  
 Held At Faith Presbyterian Church, 5075 Campanile Dr. & via Zoom Conference Call

P	Jim Jennings	President	A	Chris Luna
P	Tom Silva	Vice President	P	Robert Montana
P	Ann Cottrell	Secretary	P	B.J. Nystrom
A	David Cook	Treasurer	P	Jose Reynoso
P	Rachel Gregg	SDSU Appointee		
P	Rob Winters	SDSU AS Appointee		
P	Jim Schneider	BID Representative		
P	Robert Higdon			
P	Jean Hoeger			
P	Mike Jenkins			

TOTAL BOARD MEMBERS: 20 (momentarily 18)

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

**I Approval of Agenda.**

*Jennings*: table minutes approval; unavailable due to miscommunication.

Move to approve amended agenda: Cottrell S: Reynoso \* Approved by consensus

**II. Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meeting Wednesday, April 13, 2022**

Removed from agenda; Minutes will be presented at June meeting.

**III. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items within the CACPB.**

*A. Hamilton*

I’m concerned about projects such as 6213 Montezuma where the current building is not the story (including parking) 128 bed dormitory type building CACPB & the city approved. The applicant withdrew that permit & the city has permitted only the 4 level parking garage currently under construction. The builder has applied for a permit to build 5 residential stories (240 beds, 31 apartments) in 5 residential stories, thus 8 stories aboveground. This is far more than originally permitted, much like Boulevard 63 where the city allowed by right & without

any public review, a very different project than originally permitted.

The new permit application says affordable, but we don't know what that means because there is no other information available. We don't know if they will pay DIF or how much because the city is allowing them to build this under a ministerial permit, typically referred to as "by right," allowed under San Diego's "Complete Communities."

I want to put this on the June CACPB agenda. We need more information. And will this approach allow the builder adjacent to the library to do the same?

#### *B. Hintzman, Friends of College-Rolando Library*

1. Demographic data shows our needs represent an equity issue. We serve one of the largest populations with among the lowest median income levels of all city libraries. I've been harping on this, talking to Mayor, Library Commission etc.
2. Elo-Rivera will have a budget town hall at the library May 2. We need to make sure the budget includes money for our parking.

### **IV. New Business**

#### *A. Community Plan Update (Montana)*

1. Where we stand:
  - a. City Planners have presented 2 proposals for new College Area Plan: Grand Boulevard & 15 Minute Neighborhoods. They differ from our proposal mainly by almost eliminating "single family" detached neighborhoods, zoning them for mid-density.
  - b. May 25, 5:30 our planners will present the outcome of their survey regarding the 2 city plans. The survey presented a choice of only two options; do you like plan A or B?  
Send comments or questions for the meeting to Nathen Causeman (ncausman@sandiego.gov) or Robert Montana (robtanastan@gmail.com) ahead of time.
2. Recommendations:
  - a. We should move forward, with less time reacting to staff reports. The new plan can't be approved by Planning Commission or City Council without an EIR. EIRs require a preferred project, alternative projects & no project alternatives. We should insist that EIR present at least 4 alternatives:
    - No proposed plan. This incorporates the fact that state laws (ADUs, SB9, SB10) assure increased density & housing even without changed zoning.
    - Our 7 Visions plan which looks like their Grand Boulevards but doesn't change "single family" zoning except an area west of College Ave. & south of campus. This plan would accommodate needed growth; we'd need to further analyze parks, infrastructure.
    - City Plans. We need to insist they tell us which they prefer, including any new one.
  - b. We must insist that the city use current information:
    - Use the most recent SANDAG 14 population data which shows demand for housing increasing 35%, not the 100% assumed in the 2 city plans presented.
    - Acknowledge significant increase in currently available housing from new apartments, ADUs & acknowledge housing at the new SDSU Mission Valley.
3. Questions & Discussion
  - a. *Highmaster*: Did your plan include sufficient parking on El Cajon? Did it consider what happens to businesses if families leave due to increased student population? *Montana*: parking was not specifically addressed. Enhanced business viability was a major focus.
  - b. *Hoeger*: Families living in the area your plan upzoned are no more impacted by student rentals than some other areas. That area should not be upzoned in your plan.
  - c. *Givot*. Both city plans upzone the same neighborhoods. The Boulevards Plan zones mainly for 2-3 story town houses; 15 Minute Neighborhoods zones the same areas more

for 3-5 story apartments. Remember if affordable units are included heights can be raised without going to Planning Commission or City Council, bypassing the whole approval process.

d. *Parking discussion (consolidated)*. The fact that much of our area is in a transit priority area where parking is not required has a huge impact. Assuming people there won't use cars is unrealistic; older residents won't use mass transit. 2018 Planning Department figures show 79% of College Area residents drive cars & 85% in the entire city. Most new apartments are including parking to be marketable.

e. *Givot*. Neighbors for a Better San Diego produced a video about problems with this plan & process. We'd like to partner with CACC to conduct an educational forum to educate College Area.

#### *B. Nominations to the Board.*

1. The new Associated Students Representative is Rob Winters.
2. We have 2 open seats. Roie Moyal has applied for the 1 year seat.

I nominate Moyal: Jennings S: Cottrell

\* Approved by consensus

#### **V. Delegate Reports** *Community Planners Committee (Silva)*

The main topic was the Council Policy 600 Amendment proposed by Joe La Cava (CD 1)

A. From 2018 there have been efforts to eliminate or narrow Planning Boards (PBs). A Circulate San Diego study argued boards do not represent their communities. (Most on that board are from the development community & represent those interests.) The City Attorney then found PBs aren't legitimate unless they fulfill City Charter regulations, e.g. open elections. The city proposed about 30 egregious new rules CPC couldn't accept.

B. La Cava's amendments proposed in response to Comments from Community PBs & Interested Parties.

1. Indemnification & defense clause is preserved.
2. Stipends to PBs are secured until at least 2023.
3. New Stipend proposed for PBs (FY 2023)
4. City staff will be at CPC Meetings (probably not individual PB meetings).
5. City meeting spaces will still be available without charge.
6. Templates for required attachments are now available.
7. Voting requirements clarified
8. Attendance requirements for voting & elections will be clarified.
9. Bank accounts are not required of PBs
10. City maintained website will be available for posting PB agendas.

C. Next Steps

- June 2022: Land Use & Housing vote on proposed policy change
- July 2022: City Council hearing
- Summer 2023: "Deadline" for PBs to apply for recognition under the updated CP600-24 by filing organizational documents
- Winter/Spring 2023: City hearings to grant recognition under updated CP 600-24

#### **VI. Adjournment 8:15**

Minutes by Ann Cottrell, Secretary