

FINAL

APPROVED 6 FEBRUARY 2024

Minutes: 12/5/2023 Uptown Planners Board Meeting

Attendees:

- Mary Brown
- Mary McKenzie
- Susan White
- Juli Hyde
- Chris Cole
- Troy Weber
- Stu McGraw
- Jim Walsh
- Mary Brown
- Lu Rehling
- Don Liddell
- Patty Ducey-Brooks
- Matt Brown

ABSENT: Mat Wahlstrom

Information Items:

- Agenda and Agenda order = approved

Meeting Minutes Changes:

- Oct 3 = one change, Matt Weber to Troy Weber is only change
- Nov 7th = one change = \$33.95* to the bank balance

Treasurers report: \$33.95

Balboa Park Committee Report:

- Mary M: no changes
- Susan White stated she would like a report every month from Brer Marsh
 - Stu stated Brer is welcome and encouraged to attend Uptown Planners meetings.

Airport Committee:

- No updates: next meeting is regarding administrative building being constructed.

CPG Meeting:

- Lu attended.
- Lu asked if formal process has been made regarding CPG's and how complaints are filed. There was no update on this, but Stu stated he would follow up.
- Letter regarding Grand Jury's response to the city regarding DIF funding was discussed and is attached to the agenda from 12/5 for Uptown Planners

- Presentation was given on new group called “Inclusive Public Engagement Guide.”
 - To be used for City receiving feedback from City on local issues.
 - All CPGs were asked to complete a worksheet to provide feedback on how the city should solicit feedback from Public.
 - Worksheet = Lu suggested filling out worksheet prior to February 6th Uptown Planners meeting to submit before deadline in mid-February
 - Lu asked if a committee should be done or individually.
 - Don and Jim agreed it should be a committee.
 - Public comment: Speaker requested links to these docs to be included in minutes.

Additional Agenda Items:

- Tony Silvia put resigned. Lu stated it was important to note that Tony described part of his reason for resigning “...as much of our time is (necessarily) spent on admin matters and because the City seems to ignore our recommendations on substantive measures. In addition, with changes coming to planning groups we will have even less impact than we do now...”

Public Comment:

- Tom comment:
 - No system for getting money for local communities and there is a huge disconnect between community plan and facility plan.
 - Lu added = two other concerns were brought up:
 1. CPGs being able to influence community projects and there is a few million dollars where we do not know where it goes. City comment was it went in a big pot and not to specific communities.
 2. Grand Jury jumped in to discuss how things were handled and how they will be handled in the future.

Non-Agenda Board Comment:

- No comments

Elected Officials:

- David Mier = Director of Community Affairs, UCSD Health
 - Redevelopment for campus continues.
 - Completion of first part of first phase is nearly done.
 - Opened new clinic in Bankers Hill
 - Other big piece is Outpatient Facility which is still on track to be completed on time.
 - Jim Walsh asked: who can we reach out to from medical center to get someone to represent them on the Uptown Board?
 - David: In University, they have three spots on the board for non-voting role.
 - Would need to get process for how those folks are appointed. Contact info was provided to help with that process.
- Logan Braydis - Council member Whitburn’s office

- Biggest concern from constituents = Water bill issues and getting bills on time. They are working on it but reach out to Logan if issues persist.
- Another request has been for traffic measures.
 - Recently put an always stop corner in for Mission Hills last week.
- Budget Survey available on councilman's website
 - If you have any traffic requests or infrastructure requests, please use the website.
- Safe Sleeping O Lot = over 200 unsheltered individuals staying there
 - Jim Walsh asked about enforcement law around people not sleeping on the street. Columbia/Grape was of concern.
 - Jim filed report, said it was taken care of but that was incorrect from what he witnessed.
 - Logan stated: where we are enforcing is within 2 blocks of a school or in parks.
 - If you do see encampments, reach out to Logan's office.
 - Jim sent to Logan and his colleague responsible for Little Italy and had not heard back.
 - Mary M. Asked about deaths in safe sleeping lot.
 - Logan stated he knew of only one death and was not aware of cause.

Information Items:

- Hillcrest Sewer
 - Alex Sleiman - Senior Civil Engineer, City of SD
 - Jarret Lin = Nasland Engineering
 - Erin Westgate
 - PPT was presented, link to be shared with Chair.
 - Public Comment:
 - Speaker noted that with the new city requirements, the communities lose parking places for extra fire hydrants needed. Jarret agreed it was a good suggestion and they would take that back.
 - Matt asked for clarification on the color coding of maps.
 - Also asked if they can coordinate with the city for striping...example given was bike paths on 4th.... said to work with city to save costs.
 - Patty comment:
 - When will you notify folks who live on Reynard?
 - Jarret: nobody on Reynard will go through re-plumb.
 - Timeline: letters have already been sent to everyone getting a re-plumb. Questions from residents will be handled by site visits.
 - Month to get notarized, 6 more months to get agreements signed before the city moves on
 - Patty asked if these reps were part of City Capital Projects department, confirmed by Alex.
 - Chris Cole asked how the bidding process would be done:
 - Alex: Good Faith, Low Bid contract is the process for bidding including public advertisement for contractors to bid on.
 - Susan White: Why in Maple Canyon are they putting a water line into the canyon?
 - Alex: unsure on that specific area.

- Stu said its stormwater.
 - Alex said sometimes you cannot get away from it with canyons.
 - Patty asked that representatives come back to inform the board of other projects, so we know what projects are happening and how to communicate it out to the public.
 - Lu: if Sump Pump is put in and they receive the payment from the city, and the seller sells the house, what happens to the \$6000?
 - Alex: original owner keeps it and new owner responsible for maintenance from then on out, but most sump pumps are good for ~25 years.
 - Public comment emailed to Stu:
 - Stu to share letter from the public regarding damaging trees unnecessarily. Stu to share with City reps.
 - Jarret commented there are options to replace the roots, and we can let the city know so that the public can utilize the City Arborist to ensure we preserve the life of the tree.
 - Jarret to send PPT to Chair.
- **4100 Normal St:**
 - Stu commented a plan is being worked on for developing the plan and that outreach has been minimal and is not located on any website.
 - For record, the property is in Uptown, but a school district and therefore owned by the State.
 - Stu suggested having them present to Uptown Planners
 - Jim asked if Stu would extend invite for them to present to Uptown Planners, Stu confirmed.
 - Mary asked timeline = 3 years
 - Chris asked: is it still tied in with the Old Town Property, Stu could not confirm but believes the State abandoned the plan to pool multiple properties together.
- **Vision Zero Action Plan:**
 - Deadline for input on SANDAG = April 1st
- **1661 Harvey Milk**
 - Link included in agenda.
 - Lu commented Uptown Planners approved this plan, but a hearing was happening.
- **Scripps Mercy Hospital:**
 - Lu commented that the provision from Uptown Planners was to include preserving some of the historical pieces of this property.
 - Public comment from Tom:
 - Originally said tear out meditative garden and promised to replace it with some sort of outdoor open space – suggested the Board should check on this.
 - Lu stated she thought they heard the comments and tried to retain that garden.
 - Stu to share contact information from individual who presented to Uptown Planners and will share with Tom to f/u
 - Julie: is it taking down the whole medical facility or how much?
 - Patty said: not taking down everything, but almost everything.
 - Chris: UCSD is going out of their way to keep us informed, Scripps should do the same.
 - Mary to contact David to find out peer at Scripps to come in to present.
 - Suggestion to make this an agenda item.

Action Items:

- CPG Recognition Application:
 - Lu:
 - Few changes from the city:
 - Marlon from the City has been helpful to work with
 - Questions:
 - Asked about competitive proposals being evaluated and criteria.
 - Patty Ducey Brooks; Motion to move forward with current application, Julie 2nd.
 - Chris Cole: would certainly hope the Planning Department would not try to bolster the board as a “Jr. Planning Department”
 - Uptown Planners is meant to be a listening board for the community, and not a puffing for the mayor or anyone else
 - Lu: stated board members should be elected for CPGs, and any competitive CPG would have appointed members serving for close to a year before being able to have an election, which would be illegal.
 - Stu sent this letter and followed up, but no response from Mayor.
 - Patty: echoes what Chris is saying. Several hundred have commented on the importance of the board being elected and not appointed.
 - Lu: do we need to include this on Feb agenda:
 - Public Comment: speaker asked Lu: they anticipated not deciding until after Election in March
 - Lu: said this was stated to her from Marlon or CPG workshop at some point.
 - Public comment: Speaker commented Uptown should look into the date being public or not, and to follow up.
 - Tom: sees 4 ways to win:
 - 1. Having designated seats
 - 2. Do what Point Loma does.... elect 10 people, then appoint 4 ppl to hit diversity goals.
 - 3. Spend the next few months recruiting from diverse backgrounds.
 - 4. Win the discussion on having elections sooner rather than later, and having election before new board is seated.
 - Lu responded:
 - Asked if there is a max # of seats for appointed seats vs. elected.
 - Answer was “no - not required.”
 - Lu stated its important to acknowledge that the city doesn’t like Uptown and has been open to and encouraged competing groups to apply.
 - Public comment, Sharon: someone said there was 3 total groups, and that Tom was going around asking for people to participate in the board and if it’s another group different or if for Uptown Planners?

- Tom responded that he is collaborating with a few people to see if it was possible to pull a third group together before December and that deadline is unclear.
 - Mary M: said she believed that designated seats were struck down by Supreme Court and she does not believe it would hold up in a court of law
 - Julie: question: Is Uptown Community the one who is experiencing the most growth in developing?
 - Stu = midway is expecting comparable growth
 - Jim: suggested going back to original motion to approve Lu's report.
 - Vote; Yes: unanimous
 - Julie comment: acknowledging Lu for all her hard work to doing all of the work.
- **Plan Hillcrest:**
 - Last month: letter was sent that we didn't have enough time to review.
 - Planning Dept. responded they were going to keep original deadline for 11/30/23. If Uptown doesn't make deadline, would still consider comments from Board.
 - Sub Committee met on Zoom and came up with recommendations.
 - Lu pointed out the recommendation document and called out importance for process change in regard to partnership between planning groups and Plan Hillcrest
 - Lu stated point was to provide detailed feedback and to be reviewed seriously.
 - Public Comment: Roy: Stated that transportation needs to be prioritized to have real plan. Never addressed most important item at all. Will try to tell City Council if able.
 - Lu recommended doing more transportation studies before finalizing plan.
 - Public Comment: Tom:
 - Stated amount of density plan is not rational.
 - What they are doing is taking Mayoral advice and don't care if traffic will grind to a halt or if there are no new parks.
 - List from Committee is good but needs to incl "provision to include public facilities in a time of need."
 - Schedule meetings with key City people to explain each item one by one in order to get the changes made. Sending list won't work, meeting needs to be scheduled.
 - Lu:
 - Attended Planning Commission and heard quality arguments.
 - Stated the commission was in huge favor of Plan Hillcrest, and she was disappointed in lack of response to substantive issues.
 - Ian public comment:
 - Would hope this board approves recommendation for Plan Hillcrest. The transportation study is not the entire problem. Stated that there has been so much input on how it should go, and that folks will be disappointed if it doesn't go that well. Housing needs to be prioritized over transportation and the issue of folks moving needs to be fought with inventory.
 - Renee public comment:
 - Involved with Mira Mesa Comm. Plan
 - Arguments are all the same, suggestion for Stu was to contact Univ. City and College Area Chairs to share Uptown concerns. Doesn't think you can win on details, but if 3-4 CPGs share common language, it may help this board and other Boards having a unified opinion.

- Sharon public comment:
 - Board has not discussed Climate Change and that should be highest priority.
 - Reduce use of fossil fuels with the plan as is since not enough housing by Medical Complex
 - If it's needed, it will be built.
- Roy; public comment:
 - Uptown was in favor of moving density closer to transportation vs. reduction in housing.
- Public comment: Ellis California Jones
 - Takes trucks to work every day as do a lot of other folks that works in this area.
 - Keep in mind parking.
 - Keep in mind the folks that cannot drive due to nature of jobs in the community.
 - We do need better transportation but also better parking.
- Patty Ducey-Brooks:
 - One thing we've dedicated ourselves to is soliciting community input rather than representing ourselves.
 - Found that people are leaving because they want homes with yards, etc. and what Plan Hillcrest is providing doesn't provide this.
 - Regarding driving - community wants independence
 - Mentioned SANDAG state auditor said #s were inflated and growth will be less
- Lu to read Mat Wahlstrom's comment:
 - Question shared with Chair.
- Jim W: has the Council member produce an official position on Plan Hillcrest?
- Logan: This is a draft, and he has mentioned community input is important.
- Jim: has he been invited through you, Logan?
- Logan: Please go through the link on the website to request attendance.
- Mary: ADA requirements are based on total number of parking spaces, so you get a certain % based on total spaces. Community is getting older and will need more ADA parking spaces and ADA needs to be top of mind.
- Lu move to approve letter, 2nd by Chris.
- Julie asked how much parking was emphasized.
- Lu said we could re-prioritize if necessary.
- Don friendly amendment: include sentence or two to encapsulate what Roy said as an amendment.
- Lu stated a cover letter would be more effective. Lu approves friendly amendment of choosing #1 point being "Transportation."
- Stu mentioned the people in Hillcrest living in affordable housing where the zones will be changed, and residents will be displaced after the new developments are finished.
- Susan White; need more focus on grocery shopping centers.
- Don commented these are all great comments, but more importantly the board needs to move on so the real work can begin.
- Susan asked for the grocery shopping bullet be moved from fourteen to higher.
- 13 - Stu requested an addition of "how this line might impact and displace certain individuals of lower income."

- Mary commented to move forward as this is good and we move forward with the goal of sitting down with the City Officials
- Motion with Friendly amendment:
 - Vote Yes = unanimous

- **Election Committee Recommendation:**
 - Jim;
 - Ad Hoc committee met, Election = total of 10 seats with differing end term dates
 - Dates included in readout from Jim.
 - Need Board approval for this plan.
 - Critical part = outreach necessary to get qualified candidates to become diverse board.
 - Julie - idea related to outreach:
 - Putting an election flyer together - send to board to share out with personal networks.
 - Spread work to 1-2 ppl with folks that we know.
 - Reach out to all of town councils, need contact at Medical Complex -> Jim to f/u on that.
 - Reach out to business and community resources in each area of Uptown.
 - Looking for 2-4 business in each neighborhood of Uptown to help find candidates.
 - Jim stated to be active in getting news around town.
 - Lu wanted to review the flyers to help edit with language to help get candidates flyer.
 - Susan came up with draft, Jim sent out to folks on board, and he is open to input on language being used for target market
 - Lu supports it and will support the ask to help get folks involved.
 - Mary M. Emphasized 10ppl is a lot of candidates and it's a big number to get. And that this needs to be completed ASAP as Feb is when applications are due.
 - Motion; Lu, second by Don
 - Stu requested anyone from audience to ask questions about election if they had them.
 - Vote = yes = unanimous
 - Mary Brown left the meeting at 8:35pm
- Request for funding for GoDaddy.com
 - Lu - Can do 1-2 years, 1 year was ~\$56/yr.
 - Julie motion to approve for 1 year, 2nd by Mary.
 - Vote == yes = unanimous.

Historic Resource Committee (HRC):

- Patty Ducey-Brooks:
 - Letter included for Uptown to support letter to City.
 - Stu to write letter to board regarding the HRC board.
 - Lu - HRC board heard feedback and had agenda item for letting staff assigned to HRC to help consider policies.
 - Purpose of this letter was to say when those policies are decided upon, to let public comments be heard and not dismissed.
 - No action needed now, just a letter to remind the HRC to include feedback and not shelve it. Also noted there are too many people on the distribution list at this time.
 - Patty mentioned lots of hard work was put in and to review it, but maybe to shorten list that it is sent to and remove city council members.
 - Lu stated sending to City Council and Mayor at this point was premature.
 - Chris: unsure that some language is too open ended
 - Patty - there are changes coming that are more related to development than preservation with a focus on materials being rescued, and sustainable material.
 - When a possible historic building is being torn down, at least consider reusing components of it.
 - Lu - independent budget analyst said there were good items, but if housing was more needed, historic buildings could just be torn down.
 - Chris clarified the Historic Neighborhood commission and budget analysis should be included as areas of support vs. saying we adopt their letter.”
 - Identify what Uptown supports and what Uptown opposes.
 - Chris suggests leaving out the part “HRCinconsistent” and should specific who are in the neighborhood historic coalitions
 - Lu - to list out organizations but not the props they support.
 - Lu moves with amendment that letter not takes position on what HRC should approve, but state our approval of coalitions and identify those specific coalitions, Susan seconded
 - Mary M: friendly amendment = motion to accept sending the letter contingent upon edits suggest on 12/5 meeting
 - Friendly accepted by Lu, Susan accepts.
 - Vote = Unanimous yes.

Motion to approve board consideration for 12/2 meeting for Red Bungalow and old Mission Hills Library:

- Patty sent an email to Logan around MH Library
- Logan notified Patty that MH Library would be made into a shop and bookshop until further plans are developed.
- Key Details:
 - Current HVAC needs replacing.
 - Building requires paint, window restoration.
 - New floorings
 - Timeline = 6-8months
 - December work to begin.
 - Funding is secured.
 - Lease = library will handle.

Motion to extend by 15min by Julie, 2nd Susan.

- Further details from Patty, asked Logan to respond to questions in her email:
 - Logan:
 - Updates on MH Library:
 - Community Members voiced concerns around tampering of vacant building. Fencing was not feasible as it would obstruct sidewalks.
 - Damage to brick on the side of the building was related to drunk driver and not developer next door. That caused the delay as structural integrity had to be assessed. Structure is good and construction can start in December, and finish date is still Summer of 2024.
 - Affordable housing is not currently on the table but could be considered in future planning.
 - Contact within Library Dept. = use the general phone line, but Logan would be happy to provide updates over next 6-8months
 - Reasons why on Book Shop: no major improvements can be made due to concern over asbestos at this time.
 - Public Comment; Sol Schumer:
 - Summer 2024 - is that beginning use?
 - Logan: Construction end date is done June/July 2024 but not sure when bookstore goes in but assumes immediately after.
 - Board comment: Chris:
 - June 2024....is there a long-term lease for the bookstore?
 - Logan: no lease.
 - Don Liddell - what books are being sold?
 - Logan: library and library foundation material will be deposited at the bookstore and sold from there
 - Stu question:
 - Friends of the library that run bookstores but who is DREAM?
 - Logan - unsure of connection of library and friends of library
 - Patty - Foundation = fundraising, Friends = Volunteers
 - Lu asked Logan who runs the Downtown bookstore and see if he can share with board.
 - Chris - good that building is being used and wants updates on changes made to plan to board.
 - DREAM = Dept. of Real Estate and Airport Management
 - Logan:
 - Updates on MH Library:
 - Community Members voiced concerns around tampering of vacant building. Fencing was not feasible as it would obstruct sidewalks.
 - Damage to brick on the side of the building was related to drunk driver and not developer next door. That caused the delay as structural integrity had to be assessed. Structure is good and construction can start in December, and finish date is still Summer of 2024.
 - Affordable housing is not currently on the table but could be considered in future planning.
 - Contact within Library Dept. = use the general phone line, but Logan would be happy to provide updates over next 6-8months
 - Reasons why on Book Shop: no major improvements can be made due to concern over asbestos at this time.
 - Public Comment; Sol Schumer:
 - Summer 2024 - is that beginning use?
 - Logan: Construction end date is done June/July 2024 but not sure when bookstore goes in but assumes immediately after.
 - Board comment: Chris:
 - June 2024....is there a long-term lease for the bookstore?
 - Logan: no lease.
 - Don Liddell - what books are being sold?
 - Logan: library and library foundation material will be deposited at the bookstore and sold from there
 - Stu question:
 - Friends of the library that run bookstores but who is DREAM?
 - Logan - unsure of connection of library and friends of library
 - Patty - Foundation = fundraising, Friends = Volunteers
 - Lu asked Logan who runs the Downtown bookstore and see if he can share with board.
 - Chris - good that building is being used and wants updates on changes made to plan to board.
 - DREAM = Dept. of Real Estate and Airport Management
- Patty; site of Little Red Bungalow Meeting
 - Purpose was to speak with potential developers and community's role in the status.
 - Patty was asked to put together Recommendations for that site, to be shared with Board when applicable.
 - Stated it is helpful to sit down and discuss these as there is a lack of transparency and communication.

- Stated to change the culture to bring conversations with Developers and community to do what is right and what is best.
- Jim moved to get board approval, 2nd by Mary to get meeting with Whitburn's office for Patty to advocate for this position.
 - Public comment from Sharon; City has done research to have rules and regulations that are elected which includes all the info needed for developers.
 - Patty: collaborated with major developers to get community input and something beautiful was created and value property with this type of dialogue and positive environment.
- Motion by Lu for 5min extension, 2nd by Matt = unanimous
 - Public Comment from Ian: Had issues with Patty's statistics and where the data applies to. Need to nail down what those stats mean.
 - Second point from Ian = why is developing going ministerial and was told they avoid board as they will get sued if going by board. Transparency is needed but needs to be two-way street
 - Chris Cole: if I were a developer, and got preamble with list of items from Patty....I would think this person is against project and ignore it vs. lets go public and share your plans so you don't get sued down the road and get ahead of that with transparency.
 - Chris prefers an invitation to a meeting vs. a list of reasons the position exists so the project gets delayed. Go public early and use it to your advantage.
 - Julie - conceptually she agrees. Bigger deeper discussions are needed, and not sure a conversation with Whitburn's office will help.
 - Lu recommended tabling until 2/2 meeting so the wording can be adjusted and agreed upon.
 - Jim withdraws motions.
- Motion to adjourn at 9:20pm = approved