



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Group Meeting
November 2, 2021

DRAFT MINUTES

In attendance: Michael Brennan (left before or during agenda item V.3), Mary Brown (left during agenda item VI), Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Helen Rowe Allen, Bill Smith

Absent: Mat Wahlstrom

I. Call to order: 6:03 pm

1. Introductions

2. Adoption of agenda

Lu: Why items supposed to be carried over from October agenda (Plan Hillcrest recommendations and Brown Act recommendations) not on this meeting agenda?

Tom: Can be on December agenda.

Brer: Move Father Joes Villages and Bicycle Safety to consent agenda.

Tom & Lu: Should discuss Bicycle Safety item.

Adopt agenda with proposed amendment: Father Joes Villages a consent item, not an action item.

Motion: Mary M. Second: Chris. **Approval: unanimous.***

3. Minutes

September minutes:

Lu: Two carryover proposed changes from last meeting:

Public comments by Bill Keller were misrepresented.

These and future minutes should include supporting documents and speaker presentations as attachments.

October minutes:

Lu: Two issues: Quote by Lu re: Spaces As Places inaccurate. Why chat referenced in minutes?

Mary M: Speaker having audio problems so answered in chat.

Lu: Propose that special circumstances for any chat recorded in minutes be annotated with reason.

Approve September minutes (with two changes proposed by Lu) and October minutes (with two changes proposed by Lu):

Motion: Lu. Second Mary M. **Approval: 13-0-1**

(Bill abstained regarding September minutes, because he did not attend September

meeting; he approves October minutes.)

4. Committee reports:

Plan Hillcrest Committee:

Roy: In-person meeting passed two motions:

Ask Planning Dept how Plan Hillcrest relates to Blueprint San Diego. Request: full board approval.

Ask Planning Dept for more information about what initiated Plan Hillcrest, including why and how the program was created and what its specific goals are, especially for housing units and commercial space.

Regarding second item, city already has provided most of that information, so does not require board approval now.

Tom: Motion to approve first item?

Clint & Lu: Not agendaized as action item.

Roy: If do not receive information, then should be on next meeting agenda.

Roy: Already received another city presentation this month and may schedule another in-person meeting this month. Already reached out to city asking whether trolley line down Park Blvd still planned.

Clint: Uptown Planners previously submitted letter in support of trolley extension.

Roy: Trolley plans may have changed.

Tom: Need previous Uptown Planners support letter. 2016 community plan did not include trolley plan.

Operations & Outreach Committee:

Lu: Minutes provided for three committee meetings. In addition to pending action items, committee also addressed other issues, including social media outreach and board meeting practices. Also, committee requested raising in board meeting two other issues: Brown Act requirements regarding participation of non-committee members at committee meetings (since clarified by city; email documenting this available) and Tom's request that agenda items be requested at least 8 days in advance of board meetings.

Mary M, Tom, & Lu: Clarified city's stated position on Brown Act: participation of board members who are not committee members ok until a quorum of board reached, after which time their participation not allowed.

Balboa Park Committee: (report after CPC update because Brer previously muted)

Brer: Two meetings. Information items: Pipeline replacement project planned for Park Blvd and restoration/painting happening at the Palisades. Upcoming: Park priorities list for repairs, improvement, additions. Forms not yet available. For now: Record ideas for discussion at a later date. Possibly will go to subcommittee.

Mary M: Where building improvements? Brer: Palisades: Gym & Auto Museum.

5. CPC update:

Helen: Subbed for Tom. Major topics: Redistricting, which will take place by end of the year and presentation by Kate Sessions Trees regarding urban forestry.

Clint: At September CPC meeting there was motion regarding ADUs that Tom voted to support. That item not heard at Uptown Planners until October, so Uptown Planners had not yet acted.

Tom: Was presented as issue in concept that would return to CPC.

Announcement: Tom: Chat for recording attendance. Will disable during presentations. Open for use other times, but board will not monitor chat or answer chat questions.

II. Representatives of elected officials

Muska Laiq, Community Planning Liaison Officer at Naval Base Point Loma: Navy appreciates interest in NAVWAR. Working with Tom to find feasible presentation time. Update: Navy working on Environmental Impact Statement and response to public comments. Although Navy has preferred alternative, final EIS and record of decision not expected until 2022. Project website provides information.
Tom: Nathan Fletcher's representative stated not able to attend tonight but may come to future meetings.

III. Non-agenda public comment

Bill Keller: Spaces as Places: Revised and now addresses concerns about enforcement and differential payments based on area.
Clifford Wyler: When NAVWAR on agenda, should not be informational item but discussion of plan. When items can be added to agenda addressed in Brown Act: Section 54954.2 (b).
Oscar Tavera: Thanks to volunteer board members. Request respect for time and more efficient speaking.
Bob Daniel: Question: When and where recording of October 25th special meeting recorded available? Tom: Email to request link.
Mary B: Announcement: New historic district in Mission Hills: Inspiration Heights on National Register of Historic Places (due to work by Mission Hills Heritage). Local designation should follow soon.
Helen: Request two agenda items for next meeting: Board Decorum & Gentrification.
Mary M: Report drunk driving incident on University Ave when car drove onto sidewalk. Police did not respond for three hours. Relevant to Spaces As Places discussion. Council members should meet with business owners about this soon.
Tom: Request agenda suggestions in writing.

IV. Action items

1. Carr-Gafric residence. 2845 Union Street.

Project # 695833. Site Development Permit. Process 3.

Alicia Calhoun, Architect: Presented remodel addition of 1706 SF building with pool and pool deck at family residence and new Accessory Dwelling Unit of 1126 SF with parking deck & stairs in right of way. 0.42-acred site in RMk-2-5 and OR-1-1 base zones. Shared presentation.

Oscar Tavera: Good project. Able to use pathway between Curlew & Union St?

Sharon Gehl: Good project. Beneficial past use of paper street. No affected properties. Use of pathway?

Bill: Approve.

Brer: No concerns.

Clint: Access to stairs in public right of way? Possibilities for future from Reynard Way and Olive Street?

Gail: Great project, especially ADU.

Helen: Including two parking spaces instructive as to need.

Lu: Response to notification from neighbors? Structural specifications for building on hillside?

Has construction begun?

Mary B: Like how built into hillside. Echo Helen's comments re: parking.

Mary M: Echo Helen's comments re: parking. Pretty project.

Matt M: Favor if maintain existing pedestrian route.

Michael: Appreciate color, terracing, following contour, green roofs. Request adaptive design for public access.

Roy: Agree with Matt M & Michael.

Steve: Join Michael's comments.

Stu: Beautiful project. Thanks for green roof.

Tom: Who owns street segment/has easement? Walkability important.

Alicia Calhoun: Believe city owns street segment; will check. Access to trail around parking deck structure; perhaps could cut wall and reduce parking deck to guide walkers on path.

Construction has not begun. Neighbors notified. Structural design accounts for slopes: structural design and soil testing. Existing path is drainage ditch.

Brer: Re: drainage path: If slope >5%, room for 45" wide stair? Access would be great.

Alicia Calhoun: Already stairs at end of parking deck.

Tom: Board cannot require improvements not required by zoning, but can ask.

Kristen Gafric, Homeowner: Currently pedestrians mainly homeless campers who walk up or alongside drainage ditch, which involves scrambling, big pipe, coyotes. Other pedestrians use street above or stairs. Concern with safety. Stairs next to wall in disrepair; public also do not use because mostly on their private property. Would prefer not to narrow parking area. She and her husband open to repairing stairs, but up to city because about 25% on its property.

Chris: Building public access stairs on beach required jumping through city hoops. Not fair to homeowner to suggest changes that might open them to litigation.

Approve project: Motion: Lu. Second: Chris. **Approval: unanimous.**

2. Father Joes Villages. Thanksgiving Day 5K. (Changed to consent item.)

Rochelle Mooney: Available for questions. 20th year. Road closures 6 am – 10 am.

Send letter of support: Motion: Mary M. Second: Mary B. **Approval: unanimous.**

V. Action Items from Operations & Outreach Committee

1. Recommendation regarding website administration

Lu: Recommendation recorded in 9/29 minutes. Intended to limit access to website/domain.

Helen: Oppose withdrawing chair's access.

Stu: Why two? Why cannot officer have access?

Lu: Main concern limiting access, especially to third parties. Typical for companies and organizations to limit access.

Bill: Could give login info to city employee or somehow in escrow.

Matt M: Allow access by anyone who is current member of Uptown Planners. Change password when someone leaves.

Lu: Current third party has not been approved by board.

Mary M: Main concern: Third party person Tom worked has worked with to transition accounts for new board. Question to Bill: Why give city access to website? Question giving every board member access. Should be streamlined.

Lu: Do we still need tech support to have primary access now that transition completed?

Steve: Distinction: Day-to-day support of website and access to update separate from problem with losing domain name and that board members come and go. Need access to info

on that so that it cannot expire without someone responsible being notified again.

Tom: Had difficulty with website with loss of domain name. Eight accounts. Gail turned over info but complicated, so worked with consultant. Proposed amendment: Top access to Lu and O&O Committee, Tom, and Tom's technical support person.

Matt W: Who is consultant?

Tom: Danielle is primary (no stake in Uptown); Shayla is backup. Want in case of urgent need.

Chris: As long as does not inhibit information going out to public, no problem.

Lu: Clarify: Third-party consultant would have permanent/continual access.

Matt W: Tech support on pro bono basis?

Tom: Yes.

Matt W: Put that person's information on file with our records.

Mary M: Concerned about third party. If board not have competence needed, then accept Tom's suggestion but believe should only be officers and outreach committee.

Gail: Amendment is just those listed.

Helen: Support as amended. Need technical support.

Bill: Amend to not name names.

Stu: Comfortable with third party access given that person is professional with no interest with Uptown Planners content.

Tom: Consultant access should be easy, if/when needed, without having to authorize/de-authorize/re-authorize.

Amended proposal: Full web/domain/social media access granted to Chair of O&O Committee, one other O&O Committee member, Uptown Planners Chair, and third-party consultant. Motion: Gail. Second: Steve. **Approved: 13-1-0.**

In favor: Michael, Mary B, Chris, Roy, Clint, Gail, Brer, Stu, Mary M, Matt M, Lu, Helen, Bill.

Opposed: Steve

2. Letter to domain registrar of previous URL

Proposed letter in supporting documents. Response to cybersquat on previous website.

Researched options to address, but all seemed too expensive, cumbersome, and/or unlikely to work. Mat W drafted letter based on a friend's letter to domain registrar that caused registrar to act.

Send letter. Motion: O&O Committee. **Approval: Unanimous.**

3. Report and recommendation regarding election concerns

Lu: Recommendation in supporting documents. O&O Committee charged at September meeting to return within 90 days a response to recommendations in report on July election and to recommend if there should be bylaws changes regarding elections and, if so, what those should be. Note: Election Committee formed at October has not yet met, so we have not received input from that committee. Steve also routed a letter to the board on this issue but that has not been seen by the public, so that should be read aloud. Note in response to Steve's letter: O&O Committee meant no disrespect to anyone on the previous Election Committee, agreed previous election was well done, and favored multiple voting days.

Steve: Why are we doing this now? Comments offensive. How have other CPGs operating under same bylaws shells converted? Bob Daniels researched that extensively, but last Election Committee ran out of time before special election. Anything Election Committee recommends goes before board, which should want to expand voter inclusion and

participation. Let the committee make proposals.

Tom: Recommend accepting the O&O Committee's recommendation with no action.

Steve: Election Committee meeting called for November 7th.

Lu: Would like more discussion on O&O report and recommendation. Committee did not intend offense. Issue is not that the city shell does not allow changes to election procedure. O&O Committee open to changing procedures. Issue is time: Special election in July, not March, so we did not have a year between elections to make changes. Regular elections have to be conducted according to existing approved bylaws.

Tom: March is not the goal date for election information: Candidates would need process information by December or early January. It would not work for the Election Committee to be soliciting and informing candidates when the rules were uncertain.

Steve: Even assuming Lu & Tom are right; why take formal action before reviewing the issue?

Helen: Steve is a practicing attorney. Election Committee is best suited to represent the interests of the public.

Chris: Appreciate the time spent by people working on committees. Not comfortable telling them what they should be doing before they report.

Mary M: JD degree does not contribute to political sense on Uptown Planners. How does Steve see it possible in timeframe before March?

Steve: Work on how to modernize election never stopped.

Mary M: Why have not shared the information?

Steve: Trying to get concrete answers. All issues will be discussed at upcoming meeting. Full board can decide in December.

Tom: Proposal: Accept report; take no action now

Lu: Recommendation from committee on floor: Not take action on changing bylaws before upcoming election and upcoming election follow existing bylaws and what we have learned about city requirements. Nothing to do with curtailing or criticizing Election Committee. O&O Committee wants Election Committee recommendations for changes to bylaws so that O&O Committee can work on those for future elections.

Clint: Agree with Steve and Helen. Can perhaps use recommendations from Election Committee in 2023.

Matt M: Could be short process to draft bylaws changes and not sure how quickly city could act to approve.

Lu: Agree with previous speakers about wanting to make changes to election procedures and bylaws. Speakers also acknowledge that may/probably would not happen in time for the March 2022 election. Acknowledging that there is not time to change the bylaws for the March election and clarifying how the bylaws and city require that election to be run does not prevent the Election Committee from offering recommendations about bylaws changes.

Roy: Call for a vote? [BREAK, approximately seven minutes]

Table O&O Committee recommendation indefinitely. Motion: Roy. Second: Lu
Approval: 12-1-0.

In favor: Michael, Mary B, Steve, Chris, Roy, Clint, Gail, Brer, Stu, Mary M, Matt M, Lu, Helen, Bill. Opposed: Mary M

VI. Bicycle safety

Brer: Proposed letter included in supporting documents. Changes on Pershing Drive since deaths there. Proposed letter for improved bicycle safety in Balboa Park because of treacherous conditions. Park Blvd already scheduled for pipeline replacement project

involving resurfacing and restriping, so opportunity for immediate change. Based on input from Bike SD also recommend additional changes in area. Presentation with street view available if requested.

Oscar Tavera: Bicycle deaths shocking. Park Blvd important connection between communities.

Sharon Gehl: City restriping anyway, so does not cost money to do it right. Golden opportunity.

Roy: City quietly implemented policy that whenever resurface major streets add bike lines. About to lose 31 spaces on University Ave between 1st & 4th. Believe that Park Blvd would automatically happen with or without our support. RE: Closing the rest of streets in Balboa Park: Need more information about how much traffic currently on those roads. All traffic has to get diverted elsewhere.

Lu: Can attest to danger of these streets. Regarding Park Blvd, disagree with Class IV versus Class II bike lanes. New brightly painted bike lanes in Imperial Beach effective and less expensive than constructing barriers. Barrier bike lanes problematic for many on 4th & 5th (even before fully implemented). Concerned about Park Blvd barriers because of scooters, electric bikes, sports cyclists, and encampment litter. Not as worried about losing parking there because available elsewhere in park and plans previously approved for garage at zoo. Agree with Roy about needing info on other streets, especially where steep. Other part of Zoo Drive dangerous because of side or road car hazards. Letter should be briefer, more intense, not recommending specifics, but requesting attention and impact studies.

Gail: Support protected bike lanes. Glad to see Balboa Park cater less to cars and parking. Compare Central Park. Would be good to get rid of zoo parking lot.

Clint: Balboa Park utopia for bikers during pandemic when technically closed. Now again too dangerous. Angry with city for months about deaths. Am aggressive biker. Paint does not protect people. Examples: La Jolla/Torrey Pines Road, Camino Del Rio South. Make roads safer or more people die.

Tom: Concerned about removing parking. Some neighborhoods do not have neighborhood park. Park Blvd highly used by lower income people for recreation. Unknown impacts of completely closing Florida Drive. North Park took similar issue to Public Facilities Committee. Could Uptown Planners Public Facilities Committee review in more detail?

Stu: Would welcome issue at Public Facilities Committee. Agree with Roy: Wish more detail, including about light rail. Glad Park Blvd will be resurfaced. Want to protect cyclists. Also am aggressive cyclist. Drive in traffic to avoid side of road car hazards. Concerned about tragedies.

Matt M: Time of essence. Should vote tonight because of resurfacing. Ok to recommend closures because city would still have to go through process. Utmost importance to save lives, protect populace.

Mary M: Respect feelings of loss. Want to protect safety for all. Some bicycle lane proposals ignore that some people need to drive.

Chris: Sat in on SANDAG meetings when first bicycle proposals for Balboa Park. Lip service to safety but actual plan dangerous. Support specific methods of protection and safety.

Lu: If letter goes with specifics, possibly before having enough information, is the effect general? If specifics matter, then addressing speedily in committee and/or sending a letter less specific about how to address problems could be better. All traffic deaths regrettable. RE: buffer bike lanes, controversial (opposed by some sports cyclists) and have safety disadvantages. Require training classes for proper use. Paint obviously not concrete but also

deaths and injuries due to concrete barriers. Also, problematic transition from Class II to Class IV on Park Blvd.

Mary M: Heard advanced cyclists do not always want to use protected bike lanes because of slow cyclists. Do aggressive cyclists stay in those lanes or go in streets?

Clint: Where no lane, I take middle of entire traffic lane to avoid side of road car hazards. Aggressive cycling rightful, not illegal.

Send letter: Motion: Matt M. Second: Mary M.

Lu: Propose friendly amendment: Remove specific recommendations for fixes and instead focus on identifying safety concerns in specific areas.

Matt M: Amenable if Brer agrees to changes.

Brer: City probably will not do these things. Intent to illustrate urgency and need for strong action, which general recommendations not achieve. Golden Hills CPG has provided letter and North Park Planning Group also writing letter. RE: Park Blvd recommendation: Master plans recommended highest standard at those times; modern standards require protected bike lanes. In short-term probably painted bike lanes; hard infrastructure project would go through many channels and take years. Sensitive to comments about users of Balboa Park who use cars; but others do not do not have good access now because not safe route. RE: Florida Drive. Closure in Balboa Park Master Plan to connect hiking areas in park and protect endangered species and plants. RE: Zoo Drive: narrow, steep. Also, direct way between Golden Hill and Bankers Hill. Currently hard to access Central Mesa from Golden Hill by bicycle. City will not close Zoo Drive down but intent is to convey urgency to take steps. Wording of letter is conditional. RE: Morley Drive: Just asking for safety improvement for pedestrians and cyclists. All recommendations allow for short-term improvements that are achievable.

Matt M: Support letter as is.

Lu: Wish letter talked about other part of Zoo Drive. Appreciate clarifications on Master Plans and timelines. Perhaps barrier bike lanes elsewhere will teach people how to use.

Roy: Would be more effective if run through committee and focused on what could actually be doable instead of asking for what not think able to get. Believe city's new committee would be open to well-developed proposals.

Matt M: Problem with committee is some parts of letter address areas outside of Uptown. Park Blvd part is in Uptown.

Lu: Actually, part of Park Blvd addressed in letter is outside Uptown. Still, appropriate for us to address, same as NAVWAR.

Mary M: For those who need vehicles and parking, proposals for bike lanes should include proposals for ADA lanes that do not risk cyclists or pedestrians.

Stu: Substitute motion: Hold Public Facilities meeting this week to consider.

Tom: Vote on proposed letter already moved. If does not pass, move next to proposal for committee meeting.

Approval: 9-2-1.

In favor: Steve, Chris, Roy, Clint, Gail, Stu, Mary M, Matt M, Lu. Opposed: Helen, Bill. Abstain: Brer (reason: courtesy to others)

Announcement: Mary: Because of upcoming wrist surgery, in months ahead may require some assistance as Secretary from Tom and Lu.

VII. Confirmation of next regular meeting by Zoom. December 7, 2021.

Tom: Navy probably can provide speaker for NAVWAR. Also, development project in University Heights. Chris: What agenda items identified earlier as to be carried over from September? Lu: Plan Hillcrest and Brown Act. Also, possibly, tabled O&O Committee election recommendation.

VIII. Adjournment: 9:38 pm

Motion: Matt M. Second: Chris. **Approval: Unanimous.**

*Note: Per the bylaws, the chair does not vote except in case of a tie.

Respectfully submitted by Lu Rehling on behalf of Mary McKenzie, Secretary

Attachments: https://uptownplannerssd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2021_11_2_Minutes_ATTACHMENTS_UptownPlanners.pdf

Filename: 2021_11_2_Minutes_UptownPlanners.pdf