



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Minutes 3/2/2021

Inattendance: Bob Daniel , Clint Daniels , Dennis Seisun , Soheil Nakshab , Gail Friedt , Bill Smith , Tom Mullaney, Roy Dahl, Bill Ellig, Stephen Cline , Matt Medeiros , Stuart McGraw

Absent: Michael Brennan, Brer Marsh

I. Meeting called to order by Soheil Nakshab at 6:00pm as a quorum was present

1. Introductions of Board Members

2. Adoption of Agenda & Rules of Order

Bill Ellig moved to move items #3 & #4 to the consent agenda, Dennis Seisun 2nd, unanimously approved

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- December minutes. Mat Wahlstrom objected to comments that were attributed to him in the minutes and asked that they be removed.
 - Tom Mullaney moved to accept the minutes with Mat Wahlstrom's comments stricken, 2nd by Steve. Unanimously approved.
- February minutes were not posted in time and will be voted on at the April 2021 Meeting

4. There was no update for the CPC Meeting

5. Matt Medeiros presented an update from the Outreach & Operations Committee Meeting held on March 1 re: elections and bylaws. Zach Bunshaf's seat is considered vacated. Proposal to vacate the seats of the members who term out in 2020 on May 31st, 2021. That would allow a 60-day window to plan and hold an election at the June 1, 2021 meeting. Candidates who were on the March 2020 ballot would be vetted by the Election Committee to determine interest and eligibility. New candidates would also need to be vetted for interest and eligibility. Those elected to the vacated seats of termed-out board members and including Zach's vacated seat would run through March 2024. Election notice will be posted in the next 30 days.

- This proposal will be on the April 6, 2021 meeting agenda for discussion and

voting.

II. Representative Elected Officials

Barbara Cosio-Moreno (barbara.cosiomoreno@sen.ca.gov) – Representative of State
Senator Toni Atkins

- *Emergency Budget items passed: Golden State Stimulus Package 7.6 Billion in relief – 2 Billion of that for small business.*
- *Senate Bill 91 was passed – COVID19 Tenant Relief Act*
- *Proposal SB86 presented on March 1 – 6.6 Billion to get schools reopened.*

III. Public Comment

1. Andrew Spurlock asked about item #3 on the agenda that has been moved to the consent agenda. Requested that this item not move to consent as he was interested in discussing.
2. Lu Rehling asked to clarify moving items to the consent agenda if approved. Soheil clarified the consent agenda process. The consent agenda does not get approved until after public comment.

Board Comment: Tom Mullaney moved that item #3 (Project 672400) be moved to the regular agenda and #4 (Project 674250) be moved to the consent agenda. Bob Daniel 2nd.

IV. Action Items

1. Selection of Executive Officers: Soheil discussed voting on positions of Treasurer, Secretary, Vice Chair and Chair
 - Sol Schumer asked why this was being voted on at this meeting instead of the April meeting as noted in the bylaws. Officers serve for one year so that's from April, not March.
 - Soheil said that he asked this item to be included on the March agenda.
 - Roy Dahl said he would stay as Treasurer.
 - Soheil asked for any other board members who might want to take over one of these positions.
 - Tom proposed that we get a new secretary, but the other members remain in their posts until the June election.
 - Soheil will remain as Chair, Michael as VP until after the election
 - Soheil requested volunteer as Secretary. Clint Daniels volunteered for this position.
 - Motion to accept this proposal with the caveat that the position would be for the next 3 months. Motion by Roy Dahl, 2nd by Matt M. Unanimous approval.
2. Assignment of new Subcommittee Chair for Historic Subcommittee.
 - Bill Ellig expressed interest in the position.
 - Public comment: Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom and Mary Brown supported the nomination of Bill.

- Dennis moved to appoint Bill as Chair, 2nd by Bill Smith. Unanimous approval.
3. Project 672400: Maggie Roland presented this project. Soheil proposed that no presentation would be necessary as it a very straight forward proposal. Andrew Spurlock, public member, would be allowed to ask Maggie is questions.
- **Public comment:** Andrew Spurlock and Don Richardson who live across the street from the project (3787 Centre St.), were told by the developer that this project was going to be 5 units with 2 parking spaces each. Then found out that it was going to be converted to the condominium units as outlined in the agenda. They are surprised to find out it was just a map waiver. Asked if the builder needed to get additional approval from the city? Was there public notice about the change?
 - Noted that there was already a parking problem on this street and the additional 2 units without additional parking would only compound the problem.
 - Maggie Roland: A: the project is being built by right, so there is not additional approval or notice required to change the project. Permits have been filed. The project added 1 affordable unit and that's where the density change. The permit process does not require a hearing. The discretionary part is my presentation to the local planning group. And will also require a hearing. A permit has been issued and doesn't require a notice.
 - **Chair Comment:** Soheil – No discretionary action required, or community involved is required for this project. The original project did not require any community input on the number of units. They have right to change the project. What does require a discretionary change as presented on the agenda.
 - **Public comment:** Lu Rehling – confused about this project because it says on their website it's condominiums for rental and it's been saying that for a long time. And apparently, it's not approved for that. The notice just went up about this hearing tonight. Is there a problem with the noticing?
 - **Chair Comment:** Soheil – explained how a developer may permit a project a certain way, but during the build can change the project and start marketing that change.
 - **Board Comments:**
 - Tom Mullaney asked for more clarification about the discretionary review process and Soheil explained the process. Tom feels that ministerial approval is a problem in the city.
 - Bill Ellig expressed empathy for the situation for Andrew Spurlock and Don Richardson. He felt that the policies the city is moving towards by right eliminates the community input. Unfortunately feels it's going to get worse than better.
 - Dennis Seisun – asked if it matter what we vote? What happens if we don't approve it? It's a map change and I don't understand why we are even discussing in. Maggie said it is read into the record what the CPG finds are. She sympathizes with everyone here.
 - Roy Dahl said was was voting no because of this process. Voting against for consistency

- Tom – tendency for making more and more projects misterially does not allow public input
- Matt M. – density bonus with the low-income unit. If moved to condos can it be sold at a lower rate?
- Soheil – the unit if sold, will have to meet medium household income price point for whatever level that unit is designated (AMI)
- Clint moved to approve Item #3 as presented in the agenda. Matt 2nd. Those who voted yes: Matt, Bob, Dennis, Gail, Tom, Bill, Clint, Stephen,
 - Opposed: Bill, Roy, Stu

The item approved. 8-3-0

4. Project 674250 – Moved to Consent Agenda and approved.

V. Information Items:

1. UC San Diego Hillcrest Health Campus – Robert Clossin, Director of Campus Planning and David Meir, Public Relations, gave a presentation about UC San Diego’s new Long Range Plan Development.

- 5 main phases. First phase will start Fall 2021.
- Plan was approved November 2019, project through 2035.
- Includes 1000 apartment units

Public Comment:

- Q: Mary McKenzie - Who will the apartment be for?
 - A: Robert C. – UCSD work force housing – workers, grad students
- Q: Mary McKenzie – Are UCSD and Scripps Community communicating?
 - A: DM -Yes and had a coordinating meeting recently.
- Q: Carol Emerick – How are you going to integrate into the community? There’s already a lot of crime (crime maps) in the area from people walking around and causing issues. Will the community wellness center help address this problem? It’s mostly people who’ve been released from the hospital who wander around. Will there be public bathrooms? Lighting? How are you going to address all the crime in the area?
 - A: Robert C. – it’s great opportunity to improve safety by design. Possibility to have programs at the wellness center
 - A: DM – we’re working with community providers to help address the unsheltered individual issue and other providers. That is good feedback for the design.
- Q: Carol Emerick – Expressed that it’s more the patients with psychiatric problems who are the issue, and she hopes UCSD will address it.
 - A: DM – discussed new behavioral health hub that will at 3rd Ave.

Board Comment:

- Q: Bill Smith – How many stories for the housing units? Higher you go more green space available. Have you done fire planning for getting people in and out of those units? How much are you spending? Scripps is spending 1 Billion.
 - A: Robert C. – Height – balance and no taller than existing

hospital site (10-11 stories). Fire – yes approved on a conceptual level and working with Fire Marshal. Investment is significant.

- Q: Dennis – Is UCSD a non-profit? Which portion is ministerial, and which is discretionary?
 - A: DM – Just here to provide updates. UCSD does not go through the city process for approval. Thanked the group.
- Q: Bill Ellig: How is the project financed? Tax? Bond?
 - A: RC – not state financing. Externally financed. Housing will be public/private venture.
- Q: Clint – Real opportunity here for setting standard how private sector operates in regard to climate change. Encouraged group to push to connect the facility to transit, including removing parking spots. Encouraged more than 1000 units.
 - A: Robert C. – discussed strategies looking at to address climate change.
- Q: Tom – Since this project will not have impact fees, feels the community will get stuck with the impact without compensation.
 - A: Robert – discussed EIR (posted on website) and improvements in traffic patterns
- Q: Tom – What about helicopter noise? How are you mitigating that?
 - A: Robert – new pad will be on top of the new hospital – which is a more north location

Public Comment: Paul Jamason – expressed his support for even more housing and alternative transportation options. He has seen the incredible impact UCSD has made on the community through COVID testing and vaccinations. Despite UCSD not paying impact fees, we shouldn't forget the positive impact that UCSD has on the community.

2. Maple Canyon Restoration Project – Soheil read the agenda item and referred to the meeting flyers for this project.

- Three year-long project.

XXXX moved to adjourn the meeting, XXXX 2nd, meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

