General Meeting Minutes Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

MEMBERS PRESENT (Checked if in attendance / # represents district / Note of arrival time in box if late)					
X 1 Tracy Dezenzo	X 3 Virginia Wilson Arrived 6:04pm	X 5 Numan Stotz Arrived 6:04pm	X 7 Andrea Schlageter		
1 Vacant	X 3 Chris Chalupsky	X 5 George McCalla	7 Andrew Waltz Absent		
X 2 Elizabeth Felando	4 Craig Klein Absent	X 6 Jane Gawronski	X AL Kevin Hastings		
X 2 Richard Merriman	X 4 Anthony Ciulla	6 Vacant	AL Jenna Tatum Absent		

CALLED TO ORDER: 6:01 pm

ADJOURNED: 8:40 pm

#### **AGENDA MODIFICATIONS & APPROVAL**

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> JG/GM Yea/Nay/Abstain 9 / 0 / 0

#### **MINUTES MODIFICATIONS & APPROVAL**

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> KH/JG Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

Approved with minor edits

## REPRESENTATIVES REPORT

#### Senator Toni Atkins - Miller Saltzman:

Budget has 2.5B in homeless, housing infrastructure and affordable housing with 100M for housing projects in San Diego. SB2 1.4M for SD office of homeless and housing. Fair pay to play act has passed. AB5 passed: contractors / employees who is exempt. AB1482 passed: just cause for evictions and 5% caps on rent increases. Oct 2020 is the deadline for REAL IDs. Covered CA open enrollment is open. Holiday party. Public safety power shut offs, Senator is discussing with energy providers. GM: asked about protecting the players money or providing financial advisors?

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE** 

General Meeting Minutes Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

ACTION ITEM #1: T-Mobile OB Lifeguard Station Project #611692 (10:43)

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> NS/LF Yea/Nay/Abstain 10 / 1 / 0

AC: opposed

**MOTION:** To deny T-Mobile lifeguard station project based on lifeguard recommendations and too many unknowns.

Drawings were made available at meeting wireless facility on OB Lifeguard station. Representatives from T-Mobile (Chris and Joe) believe that the style of the installation will best fit with the architecture of the station and that the installation of 5G will give OB residents better reception and streaming capabilities. Public Comment: Many members of the public were opposed to the plan to add 5G to the lifeguard tower. Many believe that microwave radiation is physically harmful and unsafe and that there are not enough studies to prove its safety. Question was asked about it passing by the PRC. AS: stated that she chose to move it directly to the main Board meeting to expedite the meeting and decision since we were not going to have a meeting in January. She explained that we are only an advisory board and that city is going to take our recommendation and do what they wish. OB Lifeguards were present and opposed the 5G equipment additions to the tower and felt the exposure would jeopardize their health and safety, they also felt the tower was going to be rebuilt soon and there were no plans put in place for when that happened in addition they also felt that the tower was built for public safety purposes and should only be used as that. The lifeguards asked that we review alternate sites. Board Questions/Comments: KH: how close are you to the FCC limits? REP: Emissions value is 96% of FCC limit. KH: Can you install monitors that measure the radiation? **REP:** Yes they can. **TD:** fiber optics? Why isn't T-Mobile looking into it? **REP**: not a technology that would work for wifi. **TD**: Why the lifeguard tower when they are rebuilding in 3 years? REP: From an RF standpoint, it's higher up than other buildings and they don't want to place a site in a residential area. City asked to identify areas that would work and stay away from residential areas. T-Mobile reps feel as though the current structure is well integrated and when the new lifeguard tower is rebuild that they will address and redesign at that time. TD: What's the difference between 4G and 5G and why is there a greater concern? REP: 5G is simply a larger hose to transfer more info. No, It's a different frequency. RM: who is J5? REP: we are contractors. We do not work for T-Mobile. RM: what is the city getting from this? REP: it's being negotiated. RM: why the lifeguard tower? Put it somewhere else. RM: why should T-Mobile get the priority? This is not the venue to discuss 5G this is venue to discuss putting a tower on the lifeguard tower. JG: not swayed by the effects of the 5G but is swayed by the people who feel they are affected by it and if the lifeguards are feeling effected, then she is opposed to it. CC: alternate sites. What happens after 3 years? Is there language to rebid? REP: that is still being discussed with the city. CC: we don't know what the length of the contract is yet you're asking us to approve it. **REP:** there is ongoing discussion with the city, city departments and unions. **GM:** when



General Meeting Minutes Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

is activation planned? REP: within a year of permit being approved. AC: coverage in what radius? REP: referred to the map provided. AC: what is the height of the antenna? REP: 30 feet AC: we are bombarded by microwaves. Do you know if we will be exposed to more radiation once these towers are activated? REP: When you're standing below them you might get a bit more but unless you remain in a small hole and you do not intend to move around, you will not be getting any more than in other parts of the city. GM: Is there a shield that can be used to protect the lifeguards? REP: if studies come out that say there is harm then we will install something to protect them. VW: Is it not possible for companies to share antennas? Wouldn't it open the door to other companies? REP: not sharing but city prefers to colocated so all companies could be using the same site. VW: how does the exposure compare to the exposure of a microwave oven? REP: they did not know. VW: only improves a 1-2 block area why risk the safety of our lifeguards for such a small area? REP: it works with the other sites. LF: why are the lifeguards not under the same protections? AS: what are they typical terms of the contracts? REP: typically look for a 30-year lease. AS: how much can you expect to make? REP: could range from \$500-10,000 a month. KH: lifeguards, what is your plan if this gets installed? Lifeguard: we plan on serving the community as we always do. They will go to the city council and continue their fight. They are also concerned about where the money is going as it doesn't go back into the community and only into the general fund so lifeguards do not see any of it. KH: Wonderland or the apartments will get more radiation than the lifeguards and lifeguards may be in the best location because of the shielding. Concerned about additional carriers adding to the tower. RM: how would this radiation affect your existing infrastructure? Will it interfere with what is there at the lifeguard tower? REP: condition of no interference. NS: started a motion but ended up making comments about how we already have good reception and it doesn't seem necessary.

ACTION ITEM #2: 4672-4674 Long Branch Ave. Project #640965 (59:48)

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> AC/KH Yea/Nay/Abstain 10 / 1 / 0

VW: opposed

**MOTION:** Approve project as designed contingent on open issues being cleared AND (friendly amendment by KH) parking question is clarified by DSD.

KH: Convert a garage to a companion unit. PRC voted 3/1 to recommend approval to the board. Outstanding issues where: parking and size of companion unit. Outstanding issues were cleared AS: can you access this unit from the garage? APP: no you cannot. JG: clarify parking spaces. APP: 4 spots. Parking spots and garages. VW: 5000 sq ft lot size? Zoning? APP: RM1-1. This comp. unit falls under the new ADU bill. Kept under 500 sq ft. NW: what is he going to do with it? APP: he's going to use it for personal space or long term rentals. KH: FAR .61 KH: was the lone vote because 2 dwelling units plus



General Meeting Minutes Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

ADU. Believes the driveway parking is not compliant, as current code (east of SC) doesn't allow tandem parking. Wants the city to provide explanation as to why it was cleared. **VW:** Is the rule that one replaces parking for every one that is removed? **AS:** Kevin, did you get an explanation from DSD? This is one of the reasons why boards want planners at their meetings. **APP:** client conferred with Planner that parking was ok.

#### ACTION ITEM #3: Draft Housing Element (1:16:38)

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> AS/AC Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

**MOTION:** The OB Planning Board would like to request that the housing update should not be considered until action is taken to restrict STVRs and a study of vacancy rates is made.

AS: Reviewed some elements of the draft Housing Element (HE) that would pertain to OBPB and discussed goals and statistics presented in the Draft HE. Would like to focus on the Site Inventory. 102 possible new units built in OB. Not many of the new parcels were considered for low-income housing. VW: Until we stop losing housing the Vacation Rentals, it's pointless to build more. AS: The city is going to do studies. AC: Would our comments/recs be put into an updated plan? AS: Yes. It's getting our comments in front of Council so she can discuss them at future meetings. AC: When real estate changes hand, it's common for the property to go to developer or investors. Suggest that the city impose a 5-year purchase rule that requires that property is sold to residents and not inventors. This has been done in other markets. CC/AS: City has been allowed to draft a new bill since October and nothing is being done. KH: thinks 102 is light and we could put more into OB based on the zoning. Surprised the total number is not higher. We are low density. AS: We seem to be in agreement on STR regulations. KH: The rules are allowing higher density now. TD: as a citywide manifesto for housing is thought out and well planned and found the report very thorough. Feels like we are on a downward spiral and that we may not be able to keep our ideals of our community plan and that we are going to eventually have so many people in our city that we are going to have to accommodate them and that our plan is going to have to change to do so. People are going to keep coming. It's time to start thinking globally and how we can accommodate more people without compromising our town. AS: protections for residents are a piece of the policy that is missing. KH: made a comment about quote about Community Groups taking too long and thought it was wrong. AC: we should allow higher density west of Cable and preserve other zoning. KH: until a vacation rental permit is required to come before our board there is not much we can do. CC: there are state level things in motion that we won't have control over. He read the entire document and was pleased with much that was in it. Feels that we need more time to dig into it but STR's should be looked at. AC: lack of job centers and putting jobs where people live. Having transportation to get people to their jobs. Would love to see more employment centers within walking ranges. TD: we are veering away from the City of



General Meeting Minutes Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

Villages if we continue to displace people from their village if we continue to allow STRs to take over the community. **KH:** Suggest a special meeting to address these items sometimes in January.

**PUBLIC:** Where do STR's stand now? **AS:** they are the same **Nick:** Does the Housing Commission have any good ideas? **Mandy:** They've been invited and have been told it's a brown act violation.

## ACTION ITEM #4A: Budget Requests for FY 2021

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> TD/GM Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

**MOTION A:** Submit a letter to the City containing the OB Planning Board's 2020 budget requests that fall under the following categories:

- 1. Coastal Access
- 2. Infrastructure projects
- 3. Pedestrian/Bike Safety

Letter is posted on OBPB website with specific details in each category at http://oceanbeachplanning.org/files/2020/01/120619 OBPB-BudgetLetterFY2021.pdf

#### ACTION ITEM #4B: Budget Requests for FY 2021

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> KH/AS Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

**MOTION B:** Continue to discuss budget requests based on Kevin Hastings findings and list of current projects in February.

**KH:** has been generating a list based on his research. **CC:** it would help to be able to see a list and what status they are in and revisit the list. **KH:** sometimes the duration of the projects are longer than the duration of a board member. So the board continues to keep asking, requesting items that may have already been requested. **AC:** would be a great idea to see the list

## **ACTION ITEM #5: Adjourn January Meeting**

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> AC/JG Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

**MOTION:** To adjourn January meeting due to it falling on January 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### **ACTION ITEM #6: Election Committee Formation**

1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> AS/TD Yea/Nay/Abstain 11 / 0 / 0

**MOTION:** Appoint Richard Merriman and George McCalla to Election Committee.

#### **OFFICER / SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:**



# Ocean Beach Planning Board General Meeting Minutes

Date: December 4, 2019

**Location: OB Recreation Center** 

Chair Announcements & Correspondence: Bo has resigned. Draft EIR. Land Use and housing

meeting.

**Treasure Report:** \$1378.38

Secretary Report: n/a

### **LIAISON REPORTS:**

Ш	OBPB Project Review Subcommittee (PRC): next meeting annotation	uncement
	OBPB Outreach Subcommittee: Asked for show of hands or para	ade participants
	Airport Noise Advisory Committee: next meeting info	
	Census: needs census workers	

