

MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA
for the Land Use Planning Subcommittee
of the Pacific Beach Planning Group

The meeting will take place online via Zoom
on Tuesday, August 4, 2020
from 4:30pm-6pm

Send public comments or requests to receive additional meeting info to:
planning@iconcontactweb.com

Please indicate the Agenda Item or if your comment is Non-Agenda Public Comment

Call to order - a quorum is three members

ITEM 1: Adopt Agenda or make changes (note: items can only be added of an emergency nature due to public noticing requirements. If an item is not deemed urgent, it may be added to the next Agenda.)

ITEM 2: Non-Agenda Public Committee (limited to two minutes on topics related to the Subcommittee purposes)

ITEM 3: Sub-Committee Member Announcements/Comments

ITEM 4: Chair's Report - C Chase

ITEM 5: Minutes of July 27, 2020 (Action)

ITEM 6: State Land Use Bills - S Pruettt - Status Update / Possible Action

ITEM 7: City of San Diego Complete Communities (Park Master Plan, Housing Solutions, Mobility) (Action)

7a. Park Master Plan Issues from letter by D. Sharpe

June 11, 2020 Submitted by: Deborah Sharpe, ASLA Landscape Architect - and retired city planner

Points System

7a1: "Without a complete assessment of parks and recreation facilities using the proposed performance standard methodology, the impacts of the proposed policies cannot be fully understood. No outreach has been conducted toward individual community planning groups to make such an assessment. Park and recreation resources should be surveyed and assessed for each community prior to decision-makers action on this Plan."

Possible Motion: Recommend assessment of parks using the proposed points system in advance of full council hearings to adopt the Plan.

7a2: "The scoring system appears to be arbitrary and subjective, making it ripe for racking up

points to avoid having to acquire actual acreage for park purposes. To help remedy this, specific baseline, or essential park amenities, should be established for each park type to eliminate the possibility of displacement of amenities for the purpose of meeting scoring criteria. The addition of upgrades or new amenities should not be allowed to displace existing baseline amenities (including trees), such as encroachment into open turf areas, unless the turf area exceeds the baseline size identified for the particular park type."

Possible Motion: Establish a baseline for each park type

Possible Motion: The addition of upgrades or new amenities should not be allowed to displace existing baseline amenities (including trees), such as encroachment into open turf areas, unless the turf area exceeds the baseline size identified for the particular park type.

7a3: "Public Art needs to be defined and quantified in order to assign points. How would public art scoring be applied and overseen?"

++ Possible Motion: Establish public process and rationale for points for public art in public parks

Public Review

7a4: "A comprehensive Proposed Funding or Implementation Section of the plan is not included in the PMP. The plan allows for "flexibility in implementation which enables staff to adjust, refine, and improve strategies" depending on future needs and capabilities, without further approvals. Therefore, it is essential that a Review Body is established to oversee and approve the periodic proposed refinements and revisions. "

Also cited in Howard Greenstein's letter: " *Establish a Recreational Value Oversight Committee that would be responsible for monitoring the point system, identifying problems or inconsistencies, and recommending refinements or amendments to the system. The committee could be comprised of members of the public, representatives of community planning groups and/or recreation councils, landscape architects and other planning or design consultants and representatives from the Park and Recreation and Planning Departments.*"

Possible Motion: Establish a new oversight committee for monitoring the points system and recommending refinements and amendments.

Citywide Park Fees

7a5: -"Since DIF monies are collected to provide park and recreation infrastructure to serve new residents, can DIF monies be used for park improvements within Regional Parks which are identified as serving local populations (e.g., Bonita Cove, Mission Point)? Conversely, can Regional Park Improvement Funds be used to provide park infrastructure improvements within a park identified as serving local populations (e.g., Bonita Cove, Mission Point)?"

Possible Motion: Recommend Citywide Park Fees can be used for Regional Parks identified as serving local populations.

Commercialization of Parks

7a6: - *"Retail uses are not appropriate within public parks and should not be allowed to accommodate space that could be used for basic or upgraded recreational amenities. Delete all references to retail uses in the Plan."*

- *"Commercial uses are not be appropriate within public parks unless they are providing goods and services to park users. Commercialization of parks is a slippery slope that could morph into the requirement for buying something as a prerequisite to using the park and the amenities provided, such as tables/seating."*

Possible Motion: Limit sizes and establish a public review process for placing retail or commercial uses in public parks. Give preference to non-profit groups

7b. Density Increases / Affordable Housing
From the Letter by Nico Calavita and Susan Baldwin

7b1: Transitional Zoning

"Recommendation: Apply transitional zoning principles from FARs of 5 along transit corridors such as El Cajon Boulevard to lower FARs on side streets. To provide more transition, eliminate RM-1-1, RM-1-2, and RM-1-3 zones from the Initiative. These zones "permit lower density multiple dwelling units with some characteristics of single dwelling units" (San Diego Municipal Code).

Possible Motion: Apply transitional zoning principles to lower FARs on side streets.

Possible Motion: To provide more transition, eliminate RM-1-1, RM-1-2, and RM-1-3 zones from the Initiative.

7b2: Infrastructure Funding to Support Density Increases

*"Under Housing Solutions there are no FAR limits **downtown**, eliminating the current FAR acquisition and FAR incentives programs. These programs have been successful. The FAR and Bonus Payment Program, for example, has generated approximately \$10 million since 2006 to help implement the open space and park system downtown. The original fee was \$15 a square foot of building area (not of lot area); it is now close to \$19. We are concerned that the proposed change will result in less funding for downtown open space and park system and other public benefits."*

Possible motion: Prepare a comparison of the benefits of each program over time for decision makers and the public to review.

7b3: *"The proposed benefits are small because the blunt approach that treats all properties the same, regardless of their location and base density, is very ineffective in capturing land values.*

*Recommendation: Refine the value capture mechanism. **For the city to get more appropriate and greater benefits, the benefits should be tailored to the proposed FAR increase over the existing base density.** With this alternative approach--based on tiers--the inclusionary housing and fee requirements would vary on the basis of the density increases that different properties would receive (see pages 19-26 of Public Benefit Zoning: <http://>*

ebho.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/LVR-White-Paper-Full_141113.pdf for a successful example of a program implemented in San Francisco).various parcels were assigned three different heights, and the fees vary 2 depending on the increase in height. This program, now ten years old, has been extremely successful, generating tens of millions of dollars for community facilities and additional affordable housing."

Possible Motion: Review the Public Benefit Zoning program implemented in San Francisco and report how it could be implement here to sary fees on the basis of density increases that different properties would receive.

7b4: Gentrification

"According to the Housing Commission report: "Unrestricted units in the very low-income and low-income categories are increasing in price" and almost all of the approximately 2,100 unrestricted units built annually since 2000 "have been at the top of market."

Housing Solutions would result in 80 percent of the new units built being "at the top of the market." Of the twenty percent of the units required to be affordable, 10 percent would be dedicated to households at 120 percent of AMI (very close to market) and 10 percent of the units would be affordable to households making 60 percent of AMI (which is the citywide Inclusionary Housing requirement). 9 Fig.1 Parcels with naturally-affordable unrestricted units

Where are the city's affordable housing units located? Figure 1, from the Preserving Affordable Housing in the City of San Diego report shows where naturally affordable unrestricted units are concentrated. If you compare Figure 1 with the proposed FAR map, it becomes clear that, especially for the area south of I-8, the two areas mostly coincide. On one hand, then, the city is sounding the alarm over the rapid loss of low-income units, and on the other it is pushing an initiative that will inevitably accelerate that process.

Because of the gentrification, displacement, and eviction issues expressed above, the Housing Solutions proposal should not go forward as proposed. The communities affected (whose residents have been left out of the crafting of this initiative) should be brought to the table to participate fully in the planning process."

++ Possible motion: Because of the gentrification, displacement, and eviction issues expressed above, the Housing Solutions proposal should not go forward as proposed. The communities affected (whose residents have been left out of the crafting of this initiative) should be brought to the table to participate fully in the planning process.

7c. Other Issues

- Timing of Communications with Council Offices

ITEM 8: Next Meeting (Action)

--