



UPTOWN PLANNERS

6/2/2020

FINAL

In attendance: Bob Daniel, Clint Daniels, Dennis Seisun, Zach Bunshaft, Soheil Nakshab, Gail Freidt, William Smith, Tom Mullaney, Roy Dahl, Bill Ellig, Stephen Cline, Brer Marsh, Matt Medeiros, Stu McGraw.

Amie Hayes arrived at 6:30pm.

Absent: Tim Gahagan & Michael Brennan.

I. Meeting called to order by Soheil at 6:03pm

1. Introductions

Soheil clarified that elections will be postponed until it can occur in person or a process is established by the City. Michael Prinz with the City Planning Department said that so far no elections have been held by other groups. As of now, Council policy has suspended elections.

2. Adoption of Agenda & Rules of Order

Stephen moved to approve the agenda as written, Matt 2nd, approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Soheil prefaced that the minutes were accidentally listed as March, but were put on the website for approval tonight and recommended we still vote on them.

Zach moved to approve with Dennis' clarifications on his sentiments regarding the height and affordability of the 5th & Thorne project, Gail 2nd, approved unanimously.

4. Councilmember Chris Ward was scheduled to appear, but the City Council meeting ran long and he was unable to attend.

II. Action Items

1. Project Review - UCSD Hillcrest Street Vacation Amendment

Board Comment:

Brer - How does changes to Bachman place impact the proposed Bike Lanes? Answer: Two way cycle enhancements being worked on with SANDAG.

Bob Moved to support the amendment, Gail 2nd, motion approved 14-0-1. Amie abstained because she had missed the presentation.

2. Project Review 922 Barr Ave.

Board Comment:

Bob Daniel: What was the original purpose of the alley? There is an ERA in place with te City so they still have access points.

Dennis: Have the owners of lots 16 & 17 been notified? Answer: They haven't been spoken to directly, but a notice has been posted. Can they have that same access? Answer: Should not affect them at all in terms of their current property. Sharing of the vacation is not necessary.

Tom: Uncomfortable the adjoining owner was not informed.

Soheil in response to Tom: Typically, those affected receive a notice from the City.

Bill Ellig: Since the garage has been in place since the 30s, believes this property should have the rights to carry out this action.

Gail moved to approve, Stephen 2nd, motion approved 14-0-1. Dennis abstained due to the adjoining neighbors not being explicitly informed of the vacation.

3. Project Review 1832 Washington Street

Public Comment:

Lu Rehling: What is the potential traffic impact when the tank needs to be re-filled? Answer: Filled once every three days or so. Would it block the entry way? Answer: On the less busy street.

Board Comment:

Bill Ellig: Is there a recommendation for stations by the Government. Answer: Yes, air resources board. What would the damage be of a major explosion? Answer: Propane has one point of failure. Hydrogen has two separate tanks, double walled, and has seven different layers. There are also firewalls on the other side. Hypothetically, if it did explode, it would be within a 40ft diameter. Would they be willing to pull it further from the adjacent residence? Answer: May have to, but very limited and cannot move to much different location. There may be a 10-foot setback.

Matt Medeiros: Concerned about the proximity to neighbors. Is there guidance for how close it can be to a residence? Answer: All would have to be approved by the fire department.

William: Doesn't believe we have the expertise to make judgement on safety. Will vote in favor.

Tom: Supportive, likes the location near the 5 freeway.

Clint: What sort of training is conducted with the Fire Department? Answer: Currently in discussions, but the training is no different from natural gas. When there are issues, it enters a self-diagnosed safe mode.

Zach: Will trees removed from this project be replaced on site?

Brer: Echoed sentiments of making sure lost vegetation is replaced. The presenter, Shane Stephens, mentioned that this would now be included in the plan.

Zach moved to approve with the recommendation that any vegetation that removed for the project is replaced elsewhere on the property. Approved 14-1-0. Bill Ellig opposed.

4. Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment

Soheil proposed the first meeting in July be held with the full board and then a Hillcrest Focused Plan specific subcommittee can be created as needed.

Michael Prinz: Subcommittee is likely needed for a more specific discussion by mid-July. Designation of subcommittee will be placed on the July meeting agenda.

Public Comment: Sharon Gehl: The Hillcrest Business Association suggested in the past to put a cover over the freeway wide enough for mixed use housing with a bike path running through. Spoke in favor of more tall buildings, contrary to some belief, this is consistent with buildings currently in the area. Will there be an evaluation of cost for historical recognition aspects?
Answer: Yes, but no specifics as of now.

Lu: Committee of the whole preference for now was well documented in the February minutes. Wants to ensure that Hillcrest is not defined by just the Plan Hillcrest focused area but that Hillcrest as a whole is taken into account.

Board Comment:

Brer: Wants to make sure inclusivity is prioritized.

Dennis: What was the genesis of this plan update? Michael Prinz explained that based on the City's Climate Action Plan & Housing crisis, the Council deemed it necessary to expand the connection of the core of Hillcrest.

Bill: The area is much larger than expected after the 2016 City Council direction. Only land use was thrown out of the plan by Council, doesn't believe we need to "reinvent the wheel." May be important to consider future pandemics and life changes going forward.

Tom: Believes the existing community plan already has capacity for 60% more housing. Wants to make sure we know what planning department wants is transparent. How would the Mayor's "complete communities" efforts affect the focused plan? Answer: It's another tool to provide additional housing.

Zach: If we don't take the chance build more housing, increase transit, and neighbors then the City or State will force us without us getting a voice.

Gail: The old plan from 2016 obviously isn't working, businesses are closing, we need more neighbors.

Clint: This is not a punishment, it's an opportunity for people to live and thrive in this community. If they aren't living here they will live elsewhere further out and increase fossil fuel usage.

Roy: Would appreciate the City be upfront with how much density we need and then we can space it out accordingly. Wants to prioritize finding common ground while helping business and neighborhoods to thrive.

Bob moved to have a meeting on the focused plan update in July, wherein a specific subcommittee can be established, Bill 2nd, 14-1-0. Matt opposed because he didn't think it was to vote on this in the first place.

III. Letters of Support

1. San Diego Heart Walk

Matt moved to approve, Bill 2nd, approved 14-0-1. Zach abstained due to uncertainty of gathering in September.

2. SANDAG Uptown Bikeways

Public Comment:

Kathy Keehan: Spoke in favor.

Dennis: Where are matching funds coming from? Answer: 1:1 match through the State and SANDAG. Leverage state dollars to keep improvements local.

Brer moved to approve, Zach 2nd, unanimously approved 15-0-0.

Matt moved to adjourn, Zach 2nd, meeting adjourned at 8:44pm