

Meeting Notes www.pcpb.net

Date / Time: 08 June 2016 / 5:45 PM

Location: Point Loma Library / Hervey Branch Library
3701 Voltaire Street, San Diego, CA 92107



Long Range Planning Committee (LRP) of the Peninsula Community Planning Board (PCPB)

1. Board Member Attendance
 - a. Robert Goldyn *present*
 - b. Jim Hare *absent*
 - c. Jerry Lohla *present*
 - d. Laura Miller *present*
2. Guest Attendance
 - a. Jarvis Ross
 - b. James Davisson
3. Parliamentary Items
 - a. Meeting called to order by chair (Robert Goldyn) at 5:45pm.
 - b. Meeting Location – Library works best for the members; committee is coordinating with library to obtain a more appropriate room for the size of the group.
4. Non agenda public comment *no comment*
5. Informational Items / Discussion
 - a. 2257 Froude Street project / Peninsula Beacon article
 - i. When there is a community item that resides in proximity to two planning boards/groups, there should be a proximity regulation that brings both planning boards to the table for review, comment, and approval. This is a good topic to discuss for action and process.
 - b. FAA letter from elected officials
 - i. Letter was a great response from our elected officials in representation of community concerns for the Peninsula. These type of letters could be drafted by the LRP committee and brought before the board for approval, as way of supporting community concerns.
 - c. Housing and Density OpEd
 - i. Article presented immediate need for growth and offered ways to address density through smart development.
 - ii. Housing Affordability, mini dorms, granny flats, and urban infill are all concerns involved in the discussion of density, and what is appropriate for the Peninsula.
 - iii. What amount of density is fair; what amount of density is sustainable?
 - d. Seaport Village Development (Convention Center – June 14th & 15th)
 - i. Open house to display Embarcadero Development proposals is on display next week at the Convention Center. This development will have major economic and transportation impacts to San Diego and the Waterfront.
6. Action Items
 - a. Coordination of the 2016-2017 Committee Roster
 - i. 4 PCPB members are currently on the LRP committee. Julia Quin and Pete Nystrom have shown interest and are to join the committee as PCPB members.
 - b. Coordination of Non-Board Member Seats
 - i. Chair (Robert Goldyn) would like to promote a non-policy of having community members attend 2 LRP committee meetings prior to being presented to the PCPB for approval as committee community member.
 - ii. Korla Eaquina and Jarvis Ross have shown interest to join committee as community members. LRP approved motion to present their resumes to the PCPB and request approval for their seats on the LRP committee as community members.

c. Coordination of Mission Statement

- i. Mission statement as drafted by Jim Hare was approved without any changes. Robert Goldyn to present to the PCPB next board meeting to obtain approval of mission statement:

“To assess community trends and cumulative issues, initiate public discussion, consider possible responses, and make pro-active recommendations to the Board for actions to interpret, to implement and, as may prove necessary, to amend the Peninsula Community Plan.”

ii. Committee discussed ways to perform outreach and initiate public discussion:

1. Opinion / Educational articles released to community papers.
2. Drafting of letters addressing community concerns.
3. Presentations (affordable housing, smart development) to the PCPB and community members as informational items.
4. Holding working meetings in the community, as part of the LRP committee meeting, to address concerns and here input on issues.
5. Attendance by committee members at other community organization meetings and events.

7. Next steps

- a. Committee members to identify community outreach efforts for the Peninsula.
- b. Committee members to identify reactive and proactive amendment items for the Peninsula Community Plan.

8. Meeting adjourned at 6:45pm.

9. Attachments

- a. Froude Street Beacon Article
- b. FAA Letter from Elected Officials
- c. OpEd on Housing and Density

The Long Range Planning Committee is a standing committee of the Peninsula Community Planning Board. It is established, and its business is conducted, pursuant to the PCPB bylaws and City of San Diego Council Policy 600-24. The Committee Chair is PCPB Board Member Robert Goldyn. [Contact: robert.goldyn@gmail.com].

[print](#)

Residential plot on Froude Street splits communities in OB, Point Loma

by [DAVE SCHWAB](#)

05.30.16 - 01:58 pm



A quiet street straddling Point Loma and Ocean Beach planning areas has become a battleground over a developer's plans to build two homes on a split lot some neighbors consider to be undersize for the project.

The city Planning Commission is hearing an appeal May 26 of the city Development Services Department's approval of a Coastal Development Permit to demolish a single-family

home at 2257 Froude St. and replace it with two new 1,814-square-foot homes each over a 1,073-square-foot

basement/two-car garage on two legal lots.

The redevelopment project's location has, quite literally, split the Peninsula community.

One side of Froude Street is in the Peninsula Community Planning Board district while, just 50 feet or so away, homes on the other side of the street are in the Ocean Beach Planning Board district.

Tom and Judy Parry, neighbors near the project site who've resided on a block of Froude north of Voltaire Street for years, insist the Froude Street project is the wrong development in the wrong place. They point out the project's location is right on the line between planning areas, which they claim has unfairly compromised the community's right to speak out on it.

The Peninsula Community Planning Board (PCPB) voted overwhelmingly against the proposed project in February. But Ocean Beach's Planning Board was not allowed to rule on because the city considered it to be in PCPB's province.

“It will be a monstrosity,” said Judy Parry. “All the houses on this block are either Spanish-, Craftsman-style or '50s small bungalows. There is nothing like this in the neighborhood. It will not be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood.”

Parry said a rendering for the two proposed new homes shows they are all glass, wood and concrete on the exterior, nothing like surrounding residences.

And then there's the issue of parking, which Parry said is already virtually

nonexistent in the area.

“They're going to put in 24 feet of curb cuts, which means there's not going to be parking for the whole property,” argued Parry. “Where are people going to park? It's a parking war around here already. I park on the street and I have to be home before 3 p.m., otherwise I have to park far away and walk home.”

The redevelopment project incorporates some sustainable features. One is a roof-mounted photovoltaic system consisting of solar panels sufficient to generate at least 50-percent of the project's projected energy consumption.

Architect Scot Frontis could not be reached for comment.

City staff's recommendation was to deny the appeal. The Froude Street project is not appealable to the City Council, District 2 Councilwoman Lorie Zapf's office said.

© sdnews.com 2016



May 24, 2016

Mr. Michael P. Huerta
Administrator
United States Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20591

Re: San Diego Flight Operations at Lindbergh Field and Southern California TRACON

Dear Administrator Huerta:

We are writing to present our concerns, findings, and recommendations as they relate to recent flight operations at San Diego International Airport (SAN). This letter is a formal follow-up to your telephone conversation with Representative Scott Peters (CA-52) on April 5, 2016, that focused on the overwhelming number of complaints that our offices have received over the past eight months. We believe that there are workable and relatively simple solutions to resolve the distress the residents of San Diego are experiencing, and that can be implemented with your cooperation.

I. Request for FAA Investigation into Flight Operation Noise Reduction

During the 2015 comment period of the Southern California Metroplex (SoCal Metroplex) Draft Environmental Assessment, San Diegans and their elected officials repeatedly commented on the increase in noise and impacts from departing flights on their communities. The concerns reached a crescendo on October 6, 2015. FAA Regional Administrator Glen Martin attended a forum to discuss proposed changes to operations at SAN as part of the FAA SoCal Metroplex project. Over 700 San Diego residents attended that forum to voice not only their strong opposition to the SoCal Metroplex proposed changes, but to alert the FAA that noise from aircraft has dramatically increased in the months prior. That affects not only residents under the traditional flight paths, but also residents who had never experienced any such impacts. While we eagerly await FAA responses to the public comments submitted in response to the draft environmental assessment associated with SoCal Metroplex, we reiterate our vehement opposition to the proposed removal of the LOWMA waypoint (as stated in previously submitted comment letters by all of our offices and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA)). We have enclosed those letters for your reference.

FAA communications were clear before, during, and after this October meeting: only questions or comments specifically related to the changes proposed by the SoCal Metroplex project would be responded to. As such, any questions or comments about noise impacts from operations at SAN were not addressed by FAA staff at this meeting. Further, FAA staff did not appear to record or write down any of the concerns related to the SoCal Metroplex proposal that the

Mr. Michael P. Huerta
May 24, 2016
Page Two

community voiced after hours of waiting. Any questions related to current operations at SAN, however, were written down so that SDCRAA staff could address them at the conclusion of the FAA staff's appearance. Enclosed you will find Rep. Peters' letter to Administrator Huerta dated October 30, 2015, in which the community's continued concerns are highlighted. Rep. Peters' office received a response via telephone that the issues contained in that letter were related to SoCal Metroplex and, by law, could not be addressed because the comment period for the Draft Environmental Assessment was closed. The lack of responsible community engagement was shocking to us as elected officials, as well as members of the community.

In the months following, complaints about SAN operations to our offices increased exponentially: the Mission Beach community is concerned with early turn departures to the north; Point Loma is concerned with early turn departures to the south; Clairemont, Bay Park, and La Jolla are concerned with arrivals encroaching on neighborhoods that were never before impacted. And every community is concerned with seemingly lower and louder flights over their homes.

SDCRAA has taken many positive steps forward in response to community concerns and we respectfully ask that the FAA and Southern California Terminal Radar Approach Control (SCT) act correspondingly. We recently learned that the FAA is conducting an "Initiative to Address Noise Concerns of Santa Cruz/Santa Clara/San Mateo/San Francisco Counties." (Enclosed). While we understand that the three international airports studied in this initiative present a high degree of complexity as it relates to flight operations, we request the FAA to give equal consideration to the current conditions at SAN and the communities surrounding it by investigating ways to reduce noise impacts from daily flight operations.

II. NOISE DOT AGREEMENT HISTORY / LOCATION OF NOISE DOTS

In 1998, then-Congressman Brian Bilbray and then-San Diego City Councilmember Byron Wear worked with the FAA Regional Administrator, the FAA Regional Executive Manager, SCT, Lindbergh Tower representatives, National Air Traffic Controller Association representatives, and others to establish the Noise Dot Agreement (NDA). Its purpose then and now is to control departure routes from SAN and minimize impacts to surrounding communities.

The result, which was further documented by an audit performed by the California State Auditor in October 2000, was that FAA/SCT implemented "new procedures [that] direct aircraft 1.5 miles west of the shoreline before turning south. Aircraft are also directed so they do not cross Point Loma until as far south as Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery. The FAA representatives have also made assurances that Lindbergh Field air traffic controllers direct departing aircraft to a 275- or 290-degree heading when cleared for takeoff." (California State Auditor Report, October 2000, pg. 24) (Enclosed). Further, the audit states that air traffic control will direct aircraft to "fly through a departure gate about two miles wide." (California State Auditor Report, October 2000, pg. 26).


In late 2015, SCT officials admitted to Mayor Kevin Faulconer and Representative Scott Peters that the NDA had not been properly emphasized to air traffic controllers, and they committed to improving their adherence to the agreement.

In January 2016, at the SDCRAA Airport Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC) meeting, SCT officials asserted that supervisors had re-briefed all of their air traffic controllers on the NDA. Yet, community concern continued to mount that operations had not improved. In response to these concerns, Representative Scott Peters requested that SCT disclose the current latitude/longitude coordinates of the noise dots. With the help of SDCRAA staff, we discovered that the NDA, in its current form, differed from the original agreement in two ways (Enclosed is a map that illustrates these differences). First, a new noise dot was added on a 295-degree heading to protect the residents of Mission Beach from noise from northbound flights. Second, a noise dot was shifted northward, which allows eastbound, left-turn flights flying over the southern portion of the peninsula to come closer to the residential areas and Point Loma Nazarene University. No one involved in this issue has been able to discover when these changes were made, nor who authorized them. The current location of these noise dots demonstrates to our communities that the Federal government unilaterally chose not to honor agreements that were entered into in good faith with community and stakeholder input. As SAN continues to grow and increase operations, it is now more important than ever to ensure that the NDA is accurate and adhered to.


At the April 2016 SDCRAA Board meeting, the Board voted to request that the FAA/SCT abandon its noise dot on a 258-degree heading and begin using the more restrictive 265-degree dot to measure early turns and non-compliance with the NDA, consistent with SDCRAA practices. Following that meeting, we were pleased to hear that the FAA/SCT has tentatively agreed to move the left gate dot coordinate back to its original 265-degree heading, pending budgetary and procurement process delays. We support the SDCRAA Board's actions on this topic. However, as data in the next section will show, adherence to the NDA has dropped dramatically and such adherence is paramount to ensure continued peaceful coexistence with communities surrounding SAN.

III. Current SoCal TRACON Operations

The public perception is that of a dramatic increase in lower, closer and louder SAN departures and arrivals, along with ever increasing violations of the NDA. Data, as publicly documented by ANAC, demonstrates material increases in Early Turn NDA violations, as well as increases in missed approaches. While we recognize that missed approaches often occur due to safety considerations, they represent significant impacts to the community, as they are routed on a 250-degree heading that takes airplanes over a densely populated area of the Point Loma peninsula. These conditions have continued to grow at a significantly disproportionate rate to total airport operational increases. According to the early turn data from the first quarter of 2016, we are on track for over 800 early turns, which would represent a 105% increase from 2015. For your reference, SAN operations have only increased by 1% from 2014 (191,028) to 2015 (193,236).



Source: San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Airport Noise Advisory Committee 4/15/2015, 7/9/2015, 10/21/15, 1/20/2016 and 4/20/2016 Member Meeting Package



Source: San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Airport Noise Advisory Committee 1/20/2016 and 4/20/2016 Member Meeting Package

The data above indicates significant negative trending, which we believe is primarily the result of air traffic controller decision-making. We ask that SCT work to create and implement performance-based measures for air traffic controllers that would effectively reduce early turns and missed approaches.

Mr. Michael P. Huerta
May 24, 2016
Page Five

Thank you for your attention to these issues. We respectfully request that the FAA give due consideration to the San Diego International Airport and the communities that surround it by investigating and implementing ways to reduce noise impacts from daily flight operations and work with SCT to create and implement performance-based measures that would effectively reduce early turns and missed approaches.

We look forward to an update on how your agency will address critical noise concerns in San Diego.

Sincerely,



Scott Peters
Member of Congress
52nd District of California



Kevin L. Faulconer
Mayor
City of San Diego



Greg Cox
Supervisor, First District
County of San Diego



Lorie Zapf
Councilmember, District 2
City of San Diego

Housing, Traffic, Green House gases

Increased housing cost and availability, traffic congestion and Green house gases from automobile exhaust are all connected.

Housing 90% of available land in San Diego is occupied. Cheap suburban development in the city will soon be gone, if not already if you consider that the 10% remaining includes unbuildable sites. Because of the limited inventory of homes for rent or sale the prices are going up. This is aggravated by the high cost of permits, which has been reported to be 40% of the cost of home construction. San Diego continues to grow in population not because of folks moving in but because of the birth of our own children. The likelihood that our children will be able to afford to live here is fading.

Traffic and parking Most of our houses are in low density single family neighborhood and our jobs are spread out over diverse employment centers. The buses that serve these neighborhoods are infrequent because good public transportation works best when our homes and jobs are with a quarter to a half mile from efficient transportation. This makes the Cities Climate action plan for increased public transportation difficult to achieve. We are going to have increased private vehicle traffic and associated air pollution for some time to come. There are at last count 8 parking spaces in San Diego for every car. If true how come I have such a difficult time finding a place to park. The reason is that the places we want to park on weekends and evening are not the places we want to park during the day while shopping or working. We could find new uses for all those excess parking spaces. We need to get away from the car culture of congested freeways and asphalt parking lots.

Several years ago local planners including myself worked with then Planning Director Gail Goldberg to develop the concept of the “City of Villages”. It struggled because there was not sufficient money to pay for the needed public services. Then comes the toxic TOD. To get around the unfortunate label of TOD (transportation oriented development) my fellow planners have encouraged me to use the new non toxic title of “Great Villages”. I submit it is a step up over the two former concepts.

A public transportation necklace If we had a public transportation necklace of interconnected Great Villages, we could live and work in our own neighborhood. Our spouse could commute by public transportation to another Village for employment. Those of us who still need a car to do their jobs would face fewer cars on the roads. What if college students could ride a trolley to any of the university campuses? What if there was a network of day care that new moms could take their child to near their place of employment? What of grandma could walk to the pharmacy to pick up her prescriptions? What if we could get to a doctor appointment or a hospital without having to time it around rush hour traffic? What if there was a park and a school a few blocks from home? Best of all what if there was a Starbucks a block from my house?

So the basic idea has been around for years then why has it not succeeded in San Diego. For one thing **the public has a series of concerns that are wrong**. First of all the Great Villages (TODs) will not diminish property values in the surrounding area it historically increases the value of the surrounding neighborhoods because of the improved services. It does not attract “those people”

whoever “they” are. If planned right they create a balanced community for all ethnic and economic classes particularly the young and the elderly. You know,” the people we want near us”. It does not increase traffic it reduces it. Think of the failing shopping center in your neighborhood now being considered for apartment development. If it is not next to efficient public transportation the new folks are going to be crowding your streets to get around. San Diego is going to continue to grow. We used to say we needed a gate to keep those people out of San Diego. I don’t think we are going to want to keep our wives and daughters out of the hospital maternity wards. San Diegans need to stop being Nimbys and start demanding our city grow along great public transportation in the new Great Villages.