

5/12/22

PCPB LRP meeting minutes

committee members in attendance

Matt Schalles

Sam Laub

Javier Saunders

Non-committee members present

Korla Eaquina

7:15 Matt calls meeting to order

Action Item 1: discussion of 600-24

Sam asks Korla to summarize the current state of the 600-24 amendments

Korla reviews the amendment revisions from CPC

- Proposed amendments go before planning commission in June, and tentatively before city council in July.

- Most important win for CPGs is that members would retain city indemnification

- Biggest challenge will be for the group to file paperwork to maintain its organization and be recognized by the city (due summer 2023).

- Comments that a 2 year gap after a member terms out could be a problem if we continue to have trouble recruiting members.

Matt comments that it would be concerning if we continue to have difficulty recruiting members, as we need to maintain 10 to be recognized by the city, but posits this might have been an outlier year coming out of the pandemic, and is too soon to call it a trend.

Javier says that he could live with the 2 year gap, and proposes that it might be worth our time to draft comments if there is more than one of these changes we would like to address.

Matt and Sam express similar statements.

Matt motions to table the item to give members more time to review the proposed changes before the next LRP meeting.

Sam seconds

Motion passes 3-0

Action Item 2: discussion of Midway 30 ft height restriction removal and draft supplemental environmental impact report

Matt provides summary that the report indicates environmental impact in terms of views and neighborhood character

Javier asks whether there is a traffic consideration in the statement

Matt offers there are 5 keyword hits for 'traffic' in search of the draft document. A section of statement referencing Senate Bill 743 that removes traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant impacts, and replaces it with a vehicle miles traveled metric. Also points to Midway district being almost entirely in a transit priority zone. One of the other mentions of traffic comes from wording of our own Peninsula Community Plan looking to "promote multi-family infill in areas proximate to transit lines to reduce traffic congestion."

Korla pulls up a map of transit priority overlay and verifies that Midway community is indeed virtually all within a transit priority zone.

Korla mentions that when Midway PG was updating their community plan, the PCPB asked the city to do a traffic study of potential impact to the community, references letter from 2/15/18.

Javier suggests pulling from that letter to draft a follow-up to the city.

Javier motions for committee to draft a letter asking the city to evaluate traffic impacts for the Peninsula associated with the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact. re: REMOVAL OF THE MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA FROM THE COASTAL HEIGHT LIMIT.

Sam Seconds

Motion passes 3-0

Javier volunteers to draft the letter, and circulate to Sam & Matt for revision prior to full board meeting.

Sam proposes discussion of ADU development and parking at a future meeting.

Matt mentions that proximity to a transit priority zone could exempt ADUs from these requirements.

Korla says that how distance is measured for transit priority zones is relevant here. It is currently calculated by absolute distance rather than by traversable distance, mentioning that a more useful metric would take into account geographic obstacles such as canyons, to calculate a metric based on something such as walking distance.

Korla proposes the LRP organize a list of adopt a mission statement, and offers one previously used by Jim Hare when he chaired the group: "It is the mission of the Long Range Planning Subcommittee, "to assess community trends and cumulative issues, initiate public discussion,

consider possible responses, and make pro-active recommendatiosn to the Board for actions to interpret, to implement and, as may prove necessary, to amend the Peninsual Community Plan."

Matt replies that this would be a good start we could consider adopting at the next meeting. Mentions that the community plan itself states it is not supposed to be a static document.

Meeting adjourned 20:08