Uptown Community Planning Group Meeting
September 7, 2021

DRAFT MINUTES

In attendance: Michael Brennan, Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Bob Daniel, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom

Absent: Helen Rowe Allen, Clint Daniels, Bill Smith

I. Call to Order 6:05 p.m.

1. Introductions
   Attendance was informally taken before the meeting was called to order, so introductions were dispensed with.

2. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order
   No changes requested.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes for Aug. 3, 2021
   Lu Rehling asked that the August minutes reflect that she approved the July minutes and did not abstain.

   Mat Wahlstrom asked that the minutes reflect more adequately the statements made by Amanda Nelson.

   Motion to approve the August minutes with Lu Rehling’s amendment: Roy Dahl. Second by Gail Friedt.

   In favor: Michael Brennan, Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Lu Rehling.

   Abstentions: Bob Daniel and Matt Medeiros abstain because they were not at the meeting. Mat Wahlstrom abstains because he believes the minutes should reflect more precisely public comments made.

   Motion passes: 10-0-3.
4. CPC Update (Community Planners Committee)
Forming a committee to study the Mayor’s Blueprint San Diego

5. Chair’s report (Tom Mullaney)
Bob Daniel has served eight years on the Planners. His last meeting will be in September. UP will have a vacancy.

Matt Medeiros believes that Bob Daniel serves through October, and even though the City suggests immediate elections to fill vacant seats, it would be “dumb” to hold another election before March.

6. Airport Advisory and Balboa Park Committees
Chris Cole and Brer Marsh have no updates.

II. Representatives of Elected Officials

1. Benny Cartwright from Council President Pro-Tem, Stephen Whitburn
Council has been on legislative recess. The Council will be virtual when it resumes in September.

Bob Daniel asked about CM Whitburn’s positions on NAVWAR and SB 9 and 10. Benny asked to follow up with him, as he’d been on vacation and hadn’t the chance to be briefed by the CM.

III. Non-Agenda Public Comment

1. Bill Keller. Spaces for Places. Mr. Keller expressed concern about the continued use of “parklets” and sidewalks for dining. The Planning Dept. is proposing new guidelines that he believes are nothing more than the city giving away public space to restaurants. He also noted concerns about guideline and code enforcement.

2. Clifford Wyler. Reiterates that NAVWAR lies within the Uptown Planners authority, according to the bylaws.

3. Sharon Gayle. Midway area approves more development and housing.

4. Lu Rehling. Get your pronto card to ride free through September. The compass card won’t work after October 1.
Encourages the public to bring issues to our attention.

5. Matt Medeiros. Making sure new members have taken the COW Training.
Several new Board members replied in the affirmative!
IV. Action Items 6:30 p.m.

1. Sprint cell site modification, at 666 Upas St.

Project No. 691449. Presenter Delilah Bruzee, representing MD7.

Motion to approve the project: Matt Medeiros. Second: Chris Cole. Approved unanimously.

2. Appointment of Chair: Operations/Outreach Committee.

Chair Tom Mullaney recommends that the Board approve Lu Rehling as chair of the Operations/Outreach committee.

Matt Medeiros stated he would like to continue as co-chair of this subcommittee to work on the bylaws. He also stated that the Board did not appoint committee chairs in the past; that it was left to the committees themselves.

Tom expressed his preference for just one chair per committee. Tom asks for the approval of the Board for Lu Rehling as Chair of O/O committee.

Stuart recommended that the committee itself decides on leadership structure of the subcommittee.

Matt Medeiros withdrew his name from consideration for serving as co-chair.

Vote on approval of Lu Rehling as chair of the Operations and Outreach committee.

Approve: Michael Brennan, Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom

Abstentions: Bob Daniel abstains because his term is ending. Matt Medeiros abstains because he has concerns about decision making on committee appointments.

Approved: 11-0-2

3. Membership of Committees.

The Chair had sent out a form for Board members to state their membership preference, but only eight replied.

Chris Cole was unsure of what the committees do exactly, so more information would be useful.

Brer Marsh stated that he believes we could assign committee members during the meeting. He remembers “Committees don’t have members.” Brer also asked why can’t we have public members of the committee?
Lu Rehling explains that public membership of committees has been discussed and voted on in the past, and now is not the time to revisit the issue when there are many weightier concerns. There should be a baseline membership to avoid quorum issues.

Lu Rehling emphasized that our meetings need to be public, per the Brown Act.

Mat Wahlstrom. The public is always welcome to make comments. They should not have a vote. There are good reasons, though, that we limit voting to a core membership of elected members. We are indemnified by the City. We are trained on the rules of Planning Groups.

Matt Medeiros expressed opposition to standing committees. He believes the committee chair should decide the composition of each committee, recognizing the Brown Act. Discussions should welcome and listen to the public, and their comments need to be respected and encouraged.

Brer Marsh stated that he has attended both University Heights and North Park community meetings. North Park has very efficient standing committees that include non-Board members.

Mary Brown agreed. Is impressed with the North Park Planning Group and encouraged us to go more in depth and be more involved.

Mat Wahlstrom moves that the composition of subcommittees (with voting rights) consist only of elected Board members. Seconded by Roy Dahl.

Mat Wahlstrom: If we expand committee membership to non-Board members, there is no accountability. We are indemnified by the City and have been trained on the Brown Act, and other City rules, etc.

Brer Marsh: concerned about rules limiting the participation of the public, especially the inclusion of experts. Public membership in committees is allowed in our bylaws. Even if they vote on things, in the end, decisions are up to the Board. And it encourages participation.

Matt Medeiros. UP has welcomed non-Board members on committees for many years. It is only a benefit.

Roy Dahl: voting members need to have the training for legal reasons. But believes all should be heard.

Call the Question: The composition of subcommittees (with voting rights) consist only of elected UP Board members.

Chair emphasizes that this does not affect the Bylaws. This is a decision of the Board, and it can be changed in future if so decided.

In favor: Mary Brown, Mat Wahlstrom, Roy Dahl, Stu McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Lu Rehling, and Chris Cole.
Opposed: Brer Marsh, Gail Friedt, Matt Medeiros. Michael Brennan, Steve Cline
Abstentions: Bob Daniel because of his limited term.

    Motion passed 7-5-1.

3.a. Assignment of committee memberships

Tom Mullaney: Who would like to serve on which committees?

Design Review Committee. Brer Marsh, Chair. Provides a service for applicants who need to come before UP for approval.
Members: Lu Rehling, Chris Cole, Michael Brennan, Gail Friedt, Matt Madeiros

Historic Preservation Committee. Mary Brown, Chair. The Committee will be involved with Plan Hillcrest and we’ll be working with other Uptown historic organizations.
Members: Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom, Helen Rowe Allen, Stuart McGraw.

Operations/Outreach. Lu Rehling, Chair. The committee deals with bylaws and rules, but also outreach. Need to build a bigger public presence and be sure to provide prompt information.
Members: Matt Medeiros, Mat Wahlstrom, Mary McKenzie, Stu McGraw

Plan Hillcrest. Roy Dahl, Chair. Reviews the work that the City is doing on the update to the community plan.
Members: Gail Friedt, Matt Medeiros, Mary McKenzie, Mat Wahlstrom, Lu Rehling, Brer Marsh, Tom Mullaney, Roy Dahl

Public Facilities. Stuart McGraw, Chair.
Members: Mary Brown, Mary McKenzie

Motion to Approve committee membership lists as discussed, by Roy Dahl. Seconded by Mary McKenzie
Proposed amendment by Matt Medeiros that members not present at tonight’s meeting be allowed to voice their committee preferences.
Accepted as a friendly amendment.

    Motion passed. 13-0-0

4. Recommendations in the July 27th Memo from the Election Committee Chair (Steve Cline)

Tom Mullaney asked Stuart McGraw to chair the meeting for the first recommendation, involving the Chair.

#1. “The Board having received and reviewed the complaint and investigation report related to the June 17, 2021 written complaint re: conduct of Tom Mullaney makes no finding of intentional wrongdoing and as such will take no further action on the matter before closing it.”
Motion to accept #1 recommendation: Mary McKenzie. Second by Bob Daniel.

Approve: Mat Wahlstrom, Lu Rehling, Bob Daniel, Steve Cline, Mary McKenzie, Chris Cole, Roy Dahl, Mary Brown

Opposed: Brer Marsh, Gail Friedt.

Abstentions: Matt Medeiros. Does not feel the issues surrounding the complaint have been fully resolved.

Michael Brennan left the meeting at 7:46.

Motion Passed. 8-2-1

#2. “The Board should task the Bylaws Committee* with a full review of the current Bylaws to determine whether they properly and completely address current issues related to electioneering, funding for candidates/slates, and conduct of elections. The Bylaws Committee should be given a roughly ninety (90) day window to present findings/recommendations and/or proposed amendments for consideration of full Board.”

Gail Friedt: Agrees that the Operations and Outreach Committee should examine the contentious issues surrounding the last election, particularly the role of funding.

Steve Cline: There are several issues that need to be addressed. The importance of slates, electronic voting, glossy mailers. We need to look at how these elections are going to be run, focusing on increasing participation.

Brer Marsh: we need to look at what other groups are doing about running elections.

Lu Rehling: objects to the idea that the election was based on fear-mongering. Why are we concerned about funding this year, when two years ago, it was clear that one slate had more money than the other.

Roy Dahl. Mischaracterization to say that this election was about who raised the most money.

Mary McKenzie: Divisiveness on the Board is a big concern. We need to stop acting “us versus them.”

Mat Wahlstrom: We need to be as fair and inclusive as possible.

Matt Medeiros: Rise Uptown spent $150 on the 2019 election. We were not corporate shills. Agrees with Mary McKenzie about the divisiveness on the Board, and believes it lessens the effectiveness of the CPG. It creates an unpleasant environment for people who might come to our BOD meetings.

Chris Cole: Very difficult to get involvement of the community in any setting. Would like to get rid of slates. Also we need to be sure to include all Uptown communities on the Board.
**Matt Wahlstrom moves** to approve recommendation #2. Second: Matt Medeiros.

In Favor: Chris Cole, Roy Dahl, Matt Medeiros, Steve Cline, Mary McKenzie, Bob Daniel, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Matt Wahlstrom

Opposed: Lu Rehling, Mary Brown, Stuart McGraw

Motion passed 9-3-0

#3. “The Board should re-task the Election Committee (either in current form or newly formed) to identify the best methods currently available to expand eligible voter participation through electronic voter eligibility verification and voting. The Election Committee should build upon its recent research/investigation/testing of various electronic voting systems. The Election Committee should be given a roughly ninety (90) day window to present findings and proposed systems for consideration of full Board.”

Mat Wahlstrom: believes this focus may take away from the proper conduct of the March elections.

Matt Medeiros: Put an election committee in place in October to address issues of March elections.

Steven Cline: We need to consider electronic voting, and start as soon as possible, but most likely not by the March elections.

Roy Dahl: would like vey much to increase participation. But we need to do it right and take our time.

Lu Rehling: The election committee does not need to be set up before December. Many groups are going forward with electronic voting, and maybe the City will come up with tools to help CPGs.

Mary Brown: Switching to an electronic system should be examined, but not in a rush.

Gail Friedt: COVID situation will not change. We should not wait until December to set up an Elections Committee.

Mary McKenzie: Somebody needs to take the time to examine the options to conduct the elections electronically. In favor of setting up a committee.

Bob Daniel: Maybe it shouldn’t be called an Elections committee. But this could be an elections tools committee whose work would be passed on to an Elections committee.

Lu Rehling: We should vote against this recommendation.

Tom Mullaney: The Elections committee was ad hoc. We don’t know what the City wants to do in terms of conducting elections. We need to discuss Blueprint San Diego and other such issues. Do we want to be focused on Bylaws wording when we have real issues to be worried about.
We should focus on increasing participation, not necessarily only focusing on electronic means to do so.
If we want to move toward electronic voting, we need to talk to other CPGs to evaluate their experiences. We need a complete review of pros and cons. Not sure we should move away from paper voting.

Tom Mullaney suggests that we set up an elections committee in November. As Chair, he will not vote.

Mat Wahlstrom moves that the Board not approve item #3 until #2 issues are resolved. No second.

Matt Medeiros: Moves that the Board convene an Election Committee in October to prepare for the March election and to examine any appropriate means (electronic and other) and recognizing the need for flexibility, if there are social-cultural issues that require.
Second: Bob Daniel.

Mat Wahlstrom: Believes #2 needs to be addressed before #3.

Matt Medeiros: we need to plan for all contingencies, and that takes time.

Mat Wahlstrom: Offers amendment. That we form the Elections Committee in October. The Committee will present its findings for review in December. Matt Medeiros agrees to friendly amendment.

In Favor: Mary McKenzie, Mat Wahlstrom, Roy Dahl, Bob Daniel, Steve Cline, Matt Medeiros, Chris Cole, Brer Marsh, Gail Friedt
Opposed: Lu Rehling, Stu McGraw

Mary Brown is no longer present.

Motion passes: 9-2-0

#4. Steve Cline withdraws this recommendation

VI. Confirmation of next meeting. October 5, 2021

VII. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted by Mary M McKenzie, Secretary
DRAFT MINUTES

In attendance: Michael Brennan (arr. 6:30), Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Bob Daniel, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Helen Rowe Allen, Bill Smith, Mat Wahlstrom (arr. 6:15)
Absent: Roy Dahl

1. Call to Order.

1. Introductions

2. Adoption of Agenda
Motion to remove item VII (1) NAVWAR from the agenda. Motion: Clint Daniels. Second: Matt Medeiros.
Discussion about whether the NAVWAR project affects/is relevant to Uptown.

In favor: Brer Marsh, Gail Friedt, Steve Cline, Mary McKenzie, Clint Daniels, Matt Medeiros
Opposed: Helen Rowe Allen, Mary Brown, Lu Rehling, Chris Cole, Stu McGraw, Bill Smith, Bob Daniel
Motion failed. 6-7-0.

Motion to adopt agenda by Clint Daniels. Second: Lu Rehling
Motion passed. 13-0-0

3. Amendment to Minutes for July 6, to add election results.
Motion to amend July minutes to include election results. Motion: Bob Daniel. Second: Steve Cline.

Motion passed unanimously.
The amended meetings need to be put on the website and sent to the City.
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes for Sept. 7

Lu Rehling has two corrections. Public comments by Bill Keller were misrepresented. He favors Spaces as Places but had a specific programmatic issue.

Lu Rehling: The City requires that these and future minutes include supporting documents and any presentations that have been distributed to the Board. Best way to retain the records is to amend them to the minutes.

Brer Marsh asks if there is a recording of the previous meeting and, if so, requests a copy. Mary McKenzie answers in the affirmative. Lu Rehling says that the City requires that we make the recording available. Brer moves to delay approval of the minutes until next month.

Tom Mullaney asks Brer if he would go forward with approval now and make any necessary amendments later because he feels we have an obligation to post approved minutes.

Brer Marsh doesn’t see a problem with waiting until November to review the minutes. Lu would like to decide now to correct Mr. Keller’s statements.

Mat Wahlstrom. There’s no harm in delaying the approval of the minutes and states that one cannot amend minutes that have been approved. Lu Rehling states that Robert’s Rules state that we can.

Mat Wahlstrom seconds Brer’s motion to table approval until next month. Motion passed unanimously.

Matt Medeiros stated for the record that Board members Mat Wahlstrom and Michael Brennan have joined the meeting. (6:30 p.m.)

5. CPC. Update Community Planners Committee Chair Tom Mullaney reported on the CPC meeting. The main subject was ADUs and SB 9 and 10.

6. Verification of attendance.
Tom Mullaney encouraged attendees to record their attendance in the chat window, especially if interested in running for the BOD.

II. Representatives of Elected Officials.

1. Barbara Cosio-Moreno (Sen. Toni Atkins)

2. Abbey Reuter (Supervisor Nathan Fletcher)
III. Non-Agenda Public Comment.

Clifford Weiler. Mr. Weiler presented discussed the legal meaning of “action taken.” Mr. Wyler also suggested that the Brown Act always errs on the side of public participation. The Bylaws require that the Planners seek participation of the community at large.

Board comment: Clint Daniels argues that the Planners need to know more about the groups we have presenting, who they are, where their funding comes from, and if any BOD members are involved with these groups. Public disclosure due to possible conflict of interest.

Lu Rehling pointed out that Spaces as Places will be going before the City at the end of the month. The program aims to make temporary outdoor dining spaces permanent and to channel use fees into code enforcement.

IV. Action Items, Development Projects.

   Clint Daniels moved to send a letter of support. Second by Matt Medeiros.
   Motion passed unanimously.

2. **City 24 Hotel.** 2801 India St. Project 514920. Extension of Site Development Permit. This project was recommended for approval by Uptown Planners in 2017. Building permits have been issued, and site work has begun. Dana Blasi.

   Public comment: Ian Eppley urges that the Planners support the extension for this “great project in Middletown.”

   Mat Wahlstrom moves to support the extension of the permit. Second: Lu Rehling.
   Motion passed 15-0-0.


   Public Comment: Ian Epley supports this project. Ernie Bonn: Asks whether there is a plan for brush management

   Board comment: Clint Daniels asks whether the project includes environmentally-sensitive areas. Douglas Paterson replied that there will be a need for construction mitigation. Any plantings removed will be replaced in kind.
4. **Flick’s Sidewalk Cafe.** 1017 University. Project 686156. Permit to authorize the extension of the sidewalk cafe length, which was done 5 years ago. Also the railing height. Denise Larson, Larson Design.

**Public Comment:** Ben Nicholls, HBA, urges the Planners to support this permit. Flick’s is a “good neighbor” and contributes to the community.

**Board comment.** Mat Wahlstrom asks if the changes are ADA-approved. Answer was posted in chat: yes.

Lu Rehling moves to approve. Second: Chris Cole

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**V. Action Items, Community Projects and Citywide issues**

1. **Greater Hillcrest Community Benefit Association.** Benjamin Nicholls, Hillcrest Business Association.

Ben first explained that the Greater Hillcrest Community Benefit District is the same as a Special Assessments District. He made a presentation on this newly-proposed District seeking Planners’ support.

**Public Comment:**
Bill Ellig, Community Coalition of University Heights. Asks that this MAD not include University Heights. Made a presentation. Conducted a survey: 55% of business owners do not want extra services. Says Lincoln is recognized as southern border of University Heights on most maps (D3 and Redistricting Commission). He states that the Community Plan Update of 2016 draws the borders incorrectly. He will be proposing an amendment to correct this mistake.

Urges that the Planners do not approve a MAD that includes University Heights

Ben Nicholls. The reason those areas are included: Community Plan draws the borders at Washington and Park Blvd. Second, most of that area is not receiving any service, and the HBA would like to provide services to support the Normal Street Promenade. States that the HBA would not oppose drawing the border at Lincoln, but that raises the question of who will pay for maintaining that section of the Promenade.

Blake Anderson. Lives in Hillcrest and believes this is an unnecessary tax. And the HBA and the EDD are being unethical. Non-elected bodies should never be given the power to tax.

Clifford Weiler. Why aren’t religious bodies being assessed the same, if they are going to receive these services.
Ernie Bonn. Why are you (Ben) collaborating with New City America? We voted down a proposal by that organization a couple of years ago. Who’s putting up the money or the engineer’s report? Believes that University Heights should be removed from the MAD, because they are not Hillcrest.

Oscar Tavera. Supports the MAD to bring benefits to the entire community. Arguing over borders takes away from the idea that this is a shared area.

Michael Donovan. A resident who lives on 4th Avenue near Pennsylvania. "Letters of agency" are passive. Someone has to call. This provides for more active enforcement.

Nan McGraw. Concerned that we are losing our identity south of El Cajon Blvd.

Marc Johnson. University Heights Community Association. It’s about University Heights identity.

Shep and Laura Riley. Big Front Door owners. No one has reached out to them regarding this proposal. Don’t include University Heights.

Peter Raymond supports the project. Hillcrest needs to be cleaned up. And supports the Promenade.

Kristin Harms, Community Coalition of University Heights. This is an intrusion of the HBA into University Heights.

Sharon Gehl supports the MAD.

Ben Nicholls said the HBA would pay for the engineer's report. Who will maintain that block? This a property tax, so religious institutions can request to be exempt from that tax. The HBA would be willing to cut the area north of Lincoln from the project, but wants to know who's going to pay for upkeep.

Board Comment.

Matt Medeiros. Are alley ways included? Was the polling representative? More outreach needs to be done. Makes business sense to have Normal Street as one unit. All of Hillcrest is not included: why? Matt is fully supportive of the project.

Chris Cole. In a BID and does not feel he has received any benefit from it.

Mat Wahlstrom. Questions what kind of businesses were contacted? How about the hospitals? Post office? Is the Normal Street Promenade contingent on this going through?

Gail Friedt. We’ve been talking about the Promenade for years and hopes that this dispute does not postpone it further. She approves. Is anyone on the Board an active member of the UHCA?

Mary McKenzie. Echoes Gail’s comments. If there are things that can be done to assuage those in University Heights, let’s do it. Question about funding. Wasn’t the
parking district supposed to pay for the Promenade? One of Ben’s slides showed the hospital district. But the hospital district seems to be its own thing. One thing we want is security. How do we best utilize the security offered by the HBA?

Brer Marsh. Community identity is important. Is east of Texas part of University Heights?

Bill Ellig. Common definition is that University Heights does not go east from Texas, although it used to extend to the 805.

Brer Marsh. The borders of communities change over time. The Promenade needs this one block to help support it. It’s not about the lines we draw, but about the functional relationship along Normal Street. Will vote to support.

Bob Daniel. This plan has a lot of benefits, but why does it need to be solved tonight. Bob thinks there are many issues that need to be ironed out.

Michael Brennan. Echoes Brer and Gail. Neighborhood pride and identity are important, and hopes that the folks tonight opposed to the project work with the HBA to come to an agreement. The Promenade is important, and he supports the HBA plan.

Bill Smith. The Promenade needs to be maintained. We also need to maintain University Heights’ identity. There is a solution here; we just need to find it, working together with the MAD group.

Lu Rehli echoes the concerns about safety and security in Hillcrest and would like to ask the HBA to come back with a revised proposal and a little more information, perhaps examples of how much businesses will pay. This does not address homelessness. Does this just push homeless folks into other areas? Opposes today, but not in principle.

Motion by Clint Daniels to support HBA endeavors to create this improvement district to increase cleanliness and safety and the overall betterment of Hillcrest. Second: Matt Medeiros.

Ben Nicholls. Is looking for approval of the concept, big picture support.

Stuart McGraw. This is not just about identity. It’s about having a say in your own community. Believes that the HBA is not paying attention to University Heights’ community groups. Stu offers a substitute motion.

Ben Nicholls. Alley ways are not included except for Mural Alley in Hillcrest. There is no money in this proposal for branding. Some religious institutions will pay (e.g. if they own land and are making a profit). Why not residential areas? HBA is a business association. HBA is a private nonprofit, not related to New City America except that HBA hired them to set up this district. The HBA will manage the District and will receive about 10% to manage the district. Hillcrest Parking meters are paying for some of the Promenade. There are parking meters on the block north of Lincoln that are being used
by Hillcrest customers. Scripps is included. UCSD Medical Center is not involved, may be in a new BID in Mission Hills. The payment formulas are on the website. Once this plan is sent to the City, New City America will not be involved. The Promenade is happening. The question is how to maintain it. North Park pays PATH to have a full-time team in the neighborhood. Ben Nicholls is happy to work with University Heights on excluding them. Hillcrest needs the help, and Ben wants to get this going and get that block clean.

**Tom Mullaney summarizes Clint’s motion and Stu’s substitute motion.** Bob Daniels seconds Stuart’s motion. Stu offers the wording for his motion: that the applicant consult with University Heights community groups and other relevant parties and together come back to UP with a revised proposal.

Tom: Under Robert's Rules of Order, we need to decide which motion to discuss first. Let's consider Clint's motion.

Clint Daniels moved to support the HBA endeavors to create this improvement district to increase cleanliness and safety and the overall betterment of Hillcrest. Second: Matt Medeiros.

The following vote is to consider Clint's motion first:

**Yes.** Chris Cole, Mary McKenzie, Brer Marsh, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Bill Smith, Matt Medeiros, Michael Brennan, Steven Cline

**No.** Helen Rowe Allen, Stuart McGrath, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom, Bob Daniel

Mary Brown has exited the meeting. (at about 3 hrs).

**Motion to hear Clint’s motion first passes 9-5-0.**

**Board Comment:**

Mat Wahlstrom: MADs let the City push the responsibility away from itself. Approving the MAD is approving the privatization of public services. More money from business owners to fund punitive measures. There are no social services included. There is no public accountability. Cannot approve this project.

Mary McKenzie. It’s a good thing groups are stepping up to help. Supports the HBA.

Gail Friedt. Something needs to be done. Supports the HBA Plan 100%.

Matt Medeiros. Thanks Ben, for coming to us for our support. This Plan betters the Uptown District. Supports the Plan.

Ben Nicholls. This Plan needs to go to the City after it has been fully developed. So it is not a done deal yet.
Lu Rehling. We should not approve this tonight. All of the issues raised here tonight could be ignored. We should not agree on the conceptual level.

Bill Smith. Businesses have the right to tax themselves. This is a well-established approach. Has confidence that reasonable minds will prevail and HBA will work with the other interested parties. We are not rushing this through. In favor.

Brer Marsh. Appreciates all comments. Looks forward to voting on this.

Stu McGraw: Believing that the HBA will talk with these groups if this motion passes is a bit naïve. We just want to get it done right.

Stu offers an amendment to Clint’s proposal. If we vote yes on this motion, Stuart McGraw moves that it go forward without University Heights north of Lincoln. Mat Wahlstrom seconds amendment.

Clint Daniels: not a friendly amendment.

Mary McKenzie. Was going to offer an amendment, but it is not appropriate at this time.

Brer Marsh. Clint’s motion is general enough to allow HBA flexibility

Voting on Stuart McGraw’s amendment to Clint’s motion:

Yes. Helen Rowe Allen, Mat Wahlstrom, Bob Daniel, Stuart McGrath, Lu Rehling

No. Chris Cole, Brer Marsh, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Michael Brennan, Steve Cline, Bill Smith.

Motion fails. 5-9-0

Voting on Clint Daniels’ motion to support HBA endeavors to create this improvement district to increase cleanliness and safety and the overall betterment of Hillcrest.

Mat Wahlstrom believes Clint’s motion is too broad.

Yes. Helen Rowe Allen, Chris Cole, Brer Marsh, Clint Daniels, Michael Brennan, Mary McKenzie, Gail Friedt, Matt Medeiros, Steve Cline, Bill Smith


Motion passes. 10-4-0.

Lu Rehling moves to adjourn. Stuart McGraw seconds.

Matt Medeiros moves to table all items except VI (1). Mat Wahlstrom seconds. Lu Rehling accepts it as a friendly amendment.
Tom suggests that we also discuss the formation of an Ad Hoc election committee, Item VI (5).

VI. Action Items, Uptown Planners administrative tasks.

1. Recognize the end of Bob Daniel’s 8 years of service, after today’s meeting.
   The vacancy will be filled at the annual election in March 2022.

5. Form an Ad Hoc Election Committee.
   Steve Cline: UP needs a committee to explore how to build on the recent elections, including electronic voting. We need time to decide how we will conduct the election in March. A new committee needs to be formed as quickly as possible.
   Mat Wahlstrom moves to appoint Steve Cline as Election Committee Chair, and to add Bob Daniel if he is willing.
   Lu Rehling: The Bylaws dictate the policies and all procedures for elections. The election committee solicits candidates, promotes and conducts the elections and then reports. We agreed at a previous meeting that only board members can serve on committees.
   Mat Wahlstrom modifies his motion to nominate Steve Cline as Election Committee Chair.
   Tom Mullaney stated that under the bylaws, the Chair has the responsibility to choose committee chairs.
   Steve Cline is aware of what Lu Rehling stated. The Outreach and Election committees need to work together, otherwise the Election Committee is powerless.
   Matt Medeiros. The Board can give the Election Committee a little more leeway than is granted under the Bylaws.
   Mary McKenzie asks if joint meetings are allowed. Tom Mullaney stated: There is no provision in the bylaws for joint meetings. Would run into quorum issues.
   Matt Medeiros said it was done last year.
   Lu Rehling. Concerned about quorum issues. We don’t need to decide this tonight.
   Mat Wahlstrom moves that the Ad Hoc Election Committee consists of Steve Cline, Mary McKenzie, Gail Friedt and Helen Rowe Allen. Must have publicly noticed meetings. City Attorney has written a letter that Ad Hoc committees fall under the Brown Act. Second by Matt Medeiros.
Motion passed unanimously.

Tom thanks the presenters for waiting. We ran out of time.

Matt Medeiros recommends a special meeting to discuss NAVWAR with representatives from both sides. Mat Wahlstrom agrees.

Tom Mullaney: If we want to have another Zoom meeting, we need to make a statement that it is for public health reasons.

Bob Daniel: On Oct. 15, the Coastal Commission is voting on NAVWAR. Mat Wahlstrom: If you want your comments on the record, it needs to be submitted by the 8th.

VII. Confirmation of next meeting by Zoom. November 2, 2021.

VIII. Adjournment, 10 p.m.

Note: *Per the bylaws, the chair does not vote except in case of a tie.
Respectfully submitted by Mary M. McKenzie, Secretary

Filename: 2021_10_5_Minutes_UptownPlanners v3.pdf
1. Call to order: 5:09 pm (~12:01)
   a. Introductions
      Committee members present: Lu Rehling (Chair), Mary McKenzie, Mat Wahlstrom
      Committee members absent: Matt Madeiros, Stu McGraw
      Other board members present: Helen Rowe Allen
      Members of the public present: Sharon Gehl, Sol Schumer
   b. Adoption of rules of order allowing informal discussion
      Lu explained that, per guidance specified by Tom Mullaney (UP Chair), board members who
      are not members of the committee should only observe, to avoid potential violations of the
      Brown Act.
   c. Adoption of agenda: moved by Mat W, seconded by Mary M
      UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

2. Non-agenda public comment: none

3. Action items
   a. Website policies and assignment of responsibilities (~17:05)
      Lu explained that the website, email address, & Mailchimp distribution account are
      managed together. She provided background re: who currently has access privileges and
      has made recent routine updates. She explained current process for routing agendas (and
      other official UP notices): Tom routes to the Board and the city; Lu posts to website and
      routes to UP list via Mailchimp. Informal discussion followed.

      MOTION: moved by Mary M, seconded by Mat W (with a friendly amendment by Mat W):
      To secure top-level administrative credentials for the website to the Chair of the
      Operations & Outreach Committee, with an alternate on the Operations & Outreach
      Committee of the Chair’s determination entrusted with these credentials as a backup.
      Either of those entrusted with those credentials could offer only temporary access to
      others for purposes of technical support.
      UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE FULL UP BOARD.

      MOTION: moved by Mary M, seconded by Mat W:
      The administrator of the website will have sole responsibility for routine and minor
      information and routing updates. The administrator of the website will seek this
      committee’s approval for any substantive changes to content, organization, design, use,
      and domain name policies.
      UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS INTERNAL COMMITTEE POLICY.

   b. Social media policies and assignment of responsibilities (~56:50)
Lu reported that UP has Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter accounts. She provided background re: who currently has access privileges and has made recent routine updates. She explained that Mailchimp allows automatic sharing of official UP notices to all of these accounts. Informal discussion followed.

**MOTION:** moved by Lu, seconded by Mary M:

*Social media accounts will only be used to route Uptown Planners agendas, election notices, and other formal communications. Social media accounts will be blocked from other input. A member of the Operations & Outreach Committee would be responsible for monitoring their content and having administrator access.*

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS INTERNAL COMMITTEE POLICY.

c. **Response to cybersquatting on prior website URL (~1:09:30)**

Lu provided background and status info, described potential problems with confusion and/or negative content, and identified possible cybersquatting responses, including arbitration, legal action, negotiation (using a third party), and no action (except monitoring). Informal discussion followed. Mat explained that GoDaddy is the domain registrar and web hosting site that the foreign owner of UP’s former website address uses.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mary M moved, Mat W seconded:

*This committee will develop a draft letter to GoDaddy for approval by the UP board at a future meeting.*

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**NEXT STEP:** Mat W will provide a draft for Committee review at our next meeting.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA:** Lu moved, Mary M seconded:

*Extend the scheduled end time for this meeting by one half-hour.*

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

4. **Informal discussion item**

a. **Recommended revision of Uptown Planners bylaws provisions concerning elections (~01:33:01)**

Lu noted that the UP board’s charge to this committee specifies any recommendations be made by the time of the December meeting. She identified the section of the bylaws and of the city’s “shell” and administrative guidelines that apply to elections. She noted the time and effort required to amend bylaws and also that the election committee may independently recommend changes to the bylaws. Informal discussion followed (key points summarized below).

**Sharon:** The problems identified by the Chair of the previous Election Committee should be this committee’s primary concern.

**Sol:** This committee, being responsible for “operations,” should take the lead regarding election policy; actions by the Election Committee should implement.

**Mat W:** Agree with Sol, noting that this is a standing committee, while Election Committee is ad hoc. Provided link to policy letter (attached) documenting that the city has suspended its guideline prohibiting the formation of candidate slates; in his letter, the Chair of the
previous Election Committee seemed not to have been aware of this change.  
**Mary M:** Concerned about coordinating with Election Committee (per Sol) and how to get Election Committee to accept this committee having a lead role. Recommend that at least one member of this committee also serve on the Election Committee or, at least, attend Election Committee meetings. A structure to the relationship between committees could be helpful.  
**Sharon:** Noted that this committee is the only one that makes bylaws recommendations directly to the board.  
**Lu:** Noted that our current bylaws include some election procedures that the city does not require bylaws to include. Possibly, if the bylaws were amended to not include those items, the Election Committee could address them, instead. Also noted that the letter from the Chair of the previous Election Committee suggested joint meetings of this committee and the Election Committee; that potentially might require special city approvals, considerations with regard to the Brown Act, and so on.  
**Mat W:** A correct understanding of Brown Act requirements is crucial to the issue of joint meetings.  

**REQUEST FOR ACTION:** by Mat W.  
*This committee should advise the UP board to obtain a definitive opinion from the city as to whether the Brown Act requires board members never to participate in committee meetings unless they are members of that committee, even when a quorum of the full board is not present.*  
**NEXT STEP:** Lu will raise this issue in her next oral committee report to the board.  

**Mary M:** This committee should shape its work by focusing on essential bylaws concerning elections, while the Election Committee should focus only on procedures not required by the bylaws.  
**Lu:** Discussion on this agenda topic will continue at the next meeting of this committee.

5. **Schedule for next committee meeting (~01:58:05)**  
Lu advised that Tom has asked to receive requested agenda items at least 8 days in advance of board meetings. Mat said that 2 days before the agenda needs to go out should be sufficient.  

**REQUEST FOR ACTION:** by Mat W.  
*This committee should advise the UP board that Tom’s deadline for agenda items has not been approved by this committee.*  
**NEXT STEP:** Lu will raise this issue in her next oral committee report to the board.  

**PROPOSED:** by Mary M, seconded by Mat W  
*The next meeting of this committee will be on Wednesday, 10/13, 5 – 7 pm.*  
**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

6. **Adjournment: 6:59 pm (~02:03:16)**
November 25, 2019

Attention: Community Planning Group Chairs and Vice Chairs

Reference/Subject: City Council Resolution (R-312659) - Suspension of Council Policy 600-24, Article V, Section 3, regarding the "no slates" provision

Dear Community Planning Group Chairs and Vice Chairs:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the recent change to Council Policy 600-24, recommended by the City Attorney's Office and approved by the City Council. On September 17, 2019, the City Council approved Resolution R-312659 suspending the application and enforcement of Article V, Section 3 of the Council Policy and its bylaws shell, that previously prohibited Community Planning Groups (CPGs) from developing and promoting slates of candidates. This action comes in response to the settlement of a legal action alleging that the Council Policy and its required bylaws provisions violate free speech rights. The Resolution went into effect on September 19, 2019. The no slates provision is now suspended and this applies to all CPGs for both CPG board members and non-CPG board members running for election.

If you require further information, please contact Tait Galloway, Program Manager at tgalloway@sandiego.gov or 619-533-4550.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Hansen
Director, Planning Department

MH/tg

Enclosure: City Council Resolution R-312659

cc: Erik Caldwell, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Smart & Sustainable Communities
Jeremy Jung, Deputy City Attorney, Office of the San Diego City Attorney
Tom Tomlinson, Assistant Director, Planning Department
Laura C. Black, AICP, Deputy Director, Planning Department
Tait Galloway, Program Manager, Planning Department
1. **Call to order: 5:04 pm (~04:47)**
   a. **Introductions**
      Committee members present:
      Lu Rehling (Chair), Mary McKenzie (joined during discussion of item 4.a), Mat Wahlstrom, Stu McGraw
      Committee members absent: Matt Madeiros
      Other board members present: Helen Rowe Allen (left early)
      Members of the public present: Carol Emerick, Sol Schumer, stevenjd (left early)
   b. **Adoption of rules of order allowing informal discussion**
      Lu explained that, per guidance specified by Tom Mullaney (UP Chair), board members who are not members of the committee should only observe, to avoid potential violations of the Brown Act.
   c. **Adoption of agenda** moved by Mat W; **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**.

2. **Non-agenda public comment**: Carol voiced appreciation for organized procedures, especially sending out agendas.

3. **Outreach**
   a. **Website policies & related accounts (~08:57)**
      Lu noted that the board had not yet acted on the recommendations made by this committee regarding roles in managing related accounts. She has the access required to do essential work on the website and Mailchimp accounts. She does not yet have access to the domain registry.
   b. **Social media accounts (~10:44)**
      Lu reported that she should, in future, be able to automatically post to social media accounts from Mailchimp. Meanwhile, Mary M has been manually posting to Facebook.
   c. **Cybersquatting on prior website URL (~11:10)**
      Mat W explained that, due to misunderstanding, he did not have a draft letter to GoDaddy ready for our review at this meeting. At our last meeting, we had agreed to approve a draft letter as a committee before referring that course of action to the full board.

      **NEXT STEP**: Mat W will provide a draft for Committee review at our next meeting.

4. **Operations**
   a. **Best practices for conducting board meetings (~16:26)**
      Lu shared suggestions from Sol concerning conducting board meetings more efficiently and effectively. The committee members discussed these and other ideas about conducting
meetings.

**PROPOSAL moved by Mat W:**
Provide recommendations for best practices for conducting board meetings, including templates for a vote tally list.

**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CHAIR.**

**NEXT STEP:** Lu will develop the recommendations, in line with our discussion, and email them to the Chair, copying the members of this committee.

b. **Recommended revision of Uptown Planners bylaws provisions concerning elections (~01:03:51)**

Discussion addressed a range of issues, including
- Concerns recommended for consideration by the Chair of the previous Election Committee: electioneering, funding, and conduct of elections
- Possible problems/inconsistencies in the previous election regarding observation of voting
- Options for recommending best practices to candidates regarding voluntary disclosure of funding, association memberships, etc. or offering opportunities and/or requirements to report, question, and/or investigate such information
- Potential options for changes to voting procedures as currently articulated in the bylaws, including regarding multi-day voting, online voting, and mail-in voting
- The bylaws specification that the bylaws detail “all” election procedures for regular elections
- How the option of approving exceptions to the bylaws for a special election is not an option for a regular election
- The fact that the board has charged the current Election Committee to propose new regular election procedures, which would need to become bylaws provisions
- The realistic timeline required to draft changes to the bylaws; have them then debated and approved by the board; and have them then approved by the city;
- The need for procedures for the next regular election to be in place no later than February
- The possibility provided in the bylaws for a February candidate forum

**PROPOSAL moved by Lu:**
Advise the board: We do not recommend bylaws changes at this time because time is too short before March 2022 election; we would appreciate suggestions for changes from the ad hoc Election Committee that will disband after the March 2022 election; we would work on recommending bylaws changes in sufficient time before the March 2023 election. Also, we want to remind the current Election Committee of the need to follow bylaws procedures for the March 2022 election, especially noting election observation requirements and recommending exercising the option of a February candidate forum.

**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR NEXT STEP BY THIS COMMITTEE.**

**NEXT STEP:** Lu will provide a draft for Committee review at our next meeting, when we
will approve final recommendation language that we will forward to the board.

5. **Schedule for next committee meeting (~01:58:05)**
   PROPOSAL moved by Lu:
   *The next meeting of this committee will be on Wednesday, 10/27, 6 – 8 pm.*
   UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

6. **Adjournment: 6:58 pm (~02:01:04)**
1. Call to order: 6:10 pm (~11:04)
   a. Introductions
      Committee members present:
      Lu Rehling (Chair), Matt Medeiros (joined during item 4a), Mary McKenzie, Mat Wahlstrom (joined during item 2)
      Committee members absent: Stu McGraw
      Other board members present: Helen Rowe Allen, Steve Cline, Gail Friedt (arrived late)
      Members of the public present: Richard Axle (left early), Carol Emerick, Sharon Gehl (arrived late), Sol Schumer
      Adoption of rules of order allowing informal discussion
      Lu explained that the City has clarified that UP board members who are not committee members can participate unless/until a quorum of the full board is in attendance.
   b. Adoption of agenda (informal)
   c. Non-agenda comment
      Richard requested info on how to address a land use/development issue to the board; Lu referred him to the UP website and suggested that he contact the UP Chair.

2. Outreach
   a. Website policies & related accounts (~22:05)
      Lu noted that the board had not yet acted on the recommendations made by this committee regarding roles in managing related accounts. Although she has received information about passwords, including the password for the domain registry, she has not been able to use that one because its login requires phone confirmation, which goes to Tom.
   b. Social media accounts (~23:38)
      Lu reported that meeting notices have been going out to our distribution list and also been posted on Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram. Unfortunately, the city did not distribute or post the two most recent meeting agendas, even those were provided timely. Lu invited suggestions for searchable hashtags to include in social media postings.
   c. Cybersquatting on prior website URL (~25:20)
      We reviewed the draft letter to GoDaddy that Mat W provided, which is based on boilerplate language. Comments included clarifying that copyright does not require registration and what content on our site could be identified as subject to copyright. Steve also explained how quickly our prior domain name was appropriated.
      PROPOSALS moved by Lu: Before providing the draft for review by the board, edit it to identify the types of copyrighted materials that were appropriated; provide an explanation of how the new domain owner demonstrated a clear intent to misuse; and make minor
surface-level and formatting changes.

**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD**

**NEXT STEP:** Lu will edit the draft and then provide the letter to Tom for a board action item.

### 3. Operations

**a. Best practices for conducting board meetings (~46:28)**

Lu noted that Tom had responded positively to the recommendations that she sent him on behalf of this committee and also has implemented at least some of them. These include having Sol provide technical assistance at the last meeting. Sol also demonstrated that he has developed a better way to use the timer during meetings.

**Sol explained that he has learned that he could provide more helpful support if Tom transferred the host role to Sol (rather than just making him a co-host). We encouraged Sol to take this up with Tom, and Sol agreed.**

Lu also noted that Gail had provided Tom with an example North Park CPG agenda for possible use as a template when preparing future Uptown Planners board agendas and that Tom had responded positively to that, as well.

Lu opened discussion on the topic of participants’ use of the Zoom chat function during board meetings. A range of views and experiences were shared about different options for possibly controlling chat activities and whether any might be preferable to the status quo of open-ended chat use.

**PROPOSAL** moved by Mary M:

Provide Tom a summary of the options and their pros & cons.

**APPROVED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CHAIR:**

3 in favor (Mary M, Mat W, Lu); 1 abstain (Matt M – “indifferent”)

**NEXT STEP:** Lu will develop the summary, in line with our discussion, and email it to Tom, copying the members of this committee.

**b. Recommended revision of Uptown Planners bylaws provisions concerning elections (~01:18:35)**

We reviewed the report to the board that Lu drafted, which is based on our decision in our previous meeting not to recommend bylaws changes at this time and also to direct attention to options and requirements that apply to the March 2022 election. Discussion included clarification and emphasis of certain points, but no one suggested edits to the document. Matt M provided background on the previous amendments to the bylaws and about was involved in revising our bylaws consistent with city requirements. Steve noted that, if the board approves this recommendation, that will limit the scope of work for the current ad hoc Election Committee that he chairs.

[At 8 pm, Lu proposed changing the end time for the meeting to 8:15; no objections.]

**PROPOSAL** moved by Mat W to finalize our report as drafted.

**APPROVED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD.**

3 in favor (Mary M, Mat W, Lu); 1 abstain (Matt M – “not at...meeting to move it forward”)
NEXT STEPS: Lu will provide the report to Tom for a board action item. Also, we soon will begin planning our process for recommending future bylaws changes.

4. Schedule for next committee meeting (~02:07:50)
   In discussion, agreed that future meetings ideally should be on Wednesdays, 7-9 pm.
   PROPOSAL moved by Lu:
   After the 11/2 board meeting, we will decide when next to meet via email.
   UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5. Adjournment: 8:14 pm (~02:15:25)
NOTICE OF APPLICATION
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

As a property owner, tenant, or person who has requested notice, you should know that an application has been filed with the City of San Diego for a Process Three Site Development Permit for a 1,706-square-foot addition with pool and pool deck at a single family residence and a new 1,126-square-foot accessory dwelling unit with parking deck and stairs in the right of way, located at 2845 Union Street. The 0.42-acre site is in the RM-2-5 and OR-1-1 Base Zones of the Uptown Community Plan area. Council District 3.

PROJECT NO: 695833
PROJECT NAME: CARR-GAFRIC RESIDENCE SDP
PROJECT TYPE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, PROCESS THREE
APPLICANT: ALICIA CALHOON, ALICIA CALHOON ARCHITECT
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: UPTOWN
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
CITY PROJECT MANAGER: Cynthia Chong-Pelayo, Development Project Manager
PHONE NUMBER/E-MAIL: (619) 446-5121 / CChongPelayo@sandiego.gov

The decision to approve or deny this application will be made at a public hearing. You will receive another notice informing you of the date, time, and location of the public hearing. This project is undergoing environmental review.

Please note that Community Planning Groups provide citizens with an opportunity for involvement in advising the City on land use matters. Community Planning Group considerations are a recommended, but not required, part of the project review process. You may contact Tom Mullaney, Chair of the Uptown Planners at (619) 889-5626 or by email at Tom.Mullaney.UptownChair@gmail.com to inquire about the community planning group meeting dates, times, and location for community review of this project.

If you have any questions about the project after reviewing this information, you may contact the City Project Manager listed above.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.

Cost Center No. 1611170012, Internal Order No. 11004543, Fund No. 700036 (Flat Fee)
CARR-GAFRIC RESIDENCE

2845 UNION STREET

CARR-GAFRIC RESIDENCE

UNION STREET

REYNARD WAY

PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT NAME: CARR-GAFRIC RESIDENCE
OWNER: JACOB CARR AND KRISTEN GAFRIC
PROJECT NO.: PTS-0695833
YEAR BUILT: 1977
PROJECT ADDRESS: 2845 UNION STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NO.: 451-672-16-00
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOT 4 UNION SUB, MAP 008255
LOT SIZE: .42 ACRES (18,496 S.F.)
LOT WIDTH: 133.378'

AERIAL SITE PLAN

N.T.S.
2845 UNION STREET

1,706 S.F. ADDITION TO A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, NEW POOL, POOL DECK AND 1,126 S.F. NEW ADU. NEW PARKING DECK AND STAIRS IN ROW.

BUILDING ANALYSIS

BASE ZONE:
RM-2-5 AND OR-1-1

OVERLAY ZONE:
AIRPORT APPROACH OVERLAY
STEEP HILLSIDE
TRANSIT PRIORITY AREA
HISTORIC DISTRICT

GEOLOGIC HAZARD CAT.:
52

EXISTING USE:
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

PROPOSED USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

EXISTING NO. STORIES:
4 + BASEMENT

PROPOSED NO STORIES: 4 + BASEMENT

BUILDING HEIGHT:
SEE BUILDING ELEVATIONS, SHEETS A2.01-A2.03

BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT:
40'-0", 30'-0", 60 DEGREE ANGLE AT SIDE SETBACK

LOT AREA:
.42 ACRES (18,496 S.F.)

EXISTING SQUARE FOOTAGES:
FOURTH LEVEL
82 S.F.

THIRD LEVEL
1,035 S.F.

SECOND LEVEL
1,349 S.F.

FIRST LEVEL (BASEMENT)
991 S.F.

TOTAL CONDITIONED
3,457 S.F.

GARAGE
445 S.F.

ALLOWABLE FAR:
18,496 SITE AREA
ALLOWABLE BUILDABLE AREA 25% = 4,264 S.F.
4,264 S.F. X 1.34 = 6,196 S.F.> 5,163 S.F. OKAY

PROPOSED SQUARE FOOTAGES:
FOURTH LEVEL
297 S.F.

THIRD LEVEL
1,361 S.F.

SECOND LEVEL
2,309 S.F.

FIRST LEVEL (BASEMENT)
1,196 S.F.

TOTAL CONDITIONED
5,163 S.F.

GARAGE
445 S.F.

ADU
1,126 S.F.

TOTAL
1,126 S.F.
**Building Analysis**

**BASE ZONE:** RM-2-5 AND OR-1-1

**OVERLAY ZONE:** AIRPORT APPROACH OVERLAY 

**STEEP HILLSIDE**

**TRANSIT PRIORITY AREA**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT**

**GEOLOGIC HAZARD CAT.: 52**

**EXISTING USE:** SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

**PROPOSED USE:** SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

**EXISTING NO. STORIES:** 4 + BASEMENT

**PROPOSED NO. STORIES:** 4 + BASEMENT

**BUILDING HEIGHT:** SEE BUILDING ELEVATIONS, SHEETS A2.01-A2.03

**BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT:** 40'-0", 30'-0", 60 DEGREE ANGLE AT SIDE SETBACK

**LOT AREA:** .42 ACRES (18,496 S.F.)

**EXISTING SQUARE FOOTAGES:**

- FOURTH LEVEL: 82 S.F.
- THIRD LEVEL: 1,035 S.F.
- SECOND LEVEL: 1,349 S.F.
- FIRST LEVEL (BASEMENT): 991 S.F.
- TOTAL CONDITIONED: 3,457 S.F.
- GARAGE: 445 S.F.

**ALLOWABLE FAR:**

- 18,496 SITE AREA
- ALLOWABLE BUILDABLE AREA: 25% = 4,264 S.F.
- 4,264 S.F. X 1.34 = 6,196 S.F. > 5,163 S.F. OKAY

**PROPOSED SQUARE FOOTAGES:**

- FOURTH LEVEL: 297 S.F.
- THIRD LEVEL: 1,361 S.F.
- SECOND LEVEL: 2,309 S.F.
- FIRST LEVEL (BASEMENT): 1,196 S.F.
- TOTAL CONDITIONED: 5,163 S.F.
- GARAGE: 445 S.F.
- ADU: 1,126 S.F.
- TOTAL: 1,126 S.F.

**Scope of Work**

**NEW ZONING SITE PLAN**

1" = 20'-0"
Father Joe’s Villages

20th Annual Thanksgiving Day 5k

Thursday, November 25, 2021
6:30AM-10:30AM
Snapshot:

- Expected Participant #: 6,000-7,000 People
- Website: ThanksgivingRun.org
- Funds Father Joe’s Villages Food Services Program, which provides 1 million meals to neighbors in need.

Timeline:
- 6:00AM First Road Closure
- 6:30AM Check-In Opens | Optional Sunrise Mass
- 7:15AM-7:30AM Remaining roads closed off
- 7:35AM Start Time
- 8:15AM Start Line Closed
- 9:00AM-9:30AM Residential Roads Open
- 10:30AM Festival Closed | Remaining Roads & Cabrillo Bridge Open
Fr. JOE’S THANKSGIVING DAY 5K
Road Closures
*List will be sent out for viewing

First Closure:
6AM | Cabrillo Bridge

Last Re-opening
10:30AM | Pan American & Cabrillo Bridge
Thank you Uptown Planners for your support!
Fr. JOE’S THANKSGIVING DAY 5K
Road Closures

Quince St off ramp from 163 northbound 7:15 – 8:30 a.m.
Robertson St. off ramp from 163 northbound 7:15 – 9:30 a.m.
Robinson St. off ramp from 163 northbound 7:15 – 9:30 a.m.
Pan American Rd 6:30 – 10:30 a.m.
Cabrillo Bridge 6:00 – 10:30 a.m.
Balboa Dr. from Laurel to Upas St. 7:15 – 8:30 a.m.
6th St. from Upas St. to Robinson St. 7:30 – 9:00 a.m.
Robinson St from 6th St. to Vermont 7:30 – 9:00 a.m.
Vermont from Robinson to Pennsylvania 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Pennsylvania from Vermont to Richmond St 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Richmond S/B from Pennsylvania to Upas 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Upas E/B from Richmond to Park Blvd 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Park Blvd S/B from Upas to Zoo Dr 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Zoo Dr W/B From Park to the Zoo 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Zoo Pl E/B From the Zoo to Park 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Park Blvd S/B from Zoo pl to Village Pl 7:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Village Pl. from Park Blvd. to El Prado 7:30 – 10:30 a.m.
RE: Notice requesting removal of infringing material on uptownplanners.org

I am writing to advise you of a copyright infringement on a site for which you are the ISP.

I am the Chair of Uptown Planners, which is the official Community Planning Group recognized by the City of San Diego to advise on land use issues for the Uptown planning area in San Diego. (Corroborating information is available at https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community-plans/cpg/contacts.)

A website that your company hosts is being used to impersonate our organization and infringe our proprietary original content, including both images (such as our logo) and text. The infringing website is uptownplanners.org. Within 24 hours of our ownership of that domain name lapsing, the present owner (reference WHOIS record attached) appropriated our content, demonstrating a clear intention to misuse our material. For purposes of comparison, content that was appropriated is on our current website: uptownplannerssd.org.

I am sending this notice under Section 512(c) of the DMCA. On behalf of Uptown Planners, I request that you notify the infringer about this notice and tell them to remove the infringing material immediately. In addition, tell the infringer to stop posting infringing material. The law also requires that you, as the ISP, remove or disable access to the infringing content when you receive this notice.

I am sending this notice in good faith, and I have good reason to believe that copyrights our organization owns are being infringed. I certify, under the penalty of perjury, that the information in this notice is correct and that I have the authority to act on behalf of this organization that owns the copyrights in question.

Because of the importance of this infringement for our Community Planning Group, we would appreciate receiving confirmation soon that you will take steps to remove the infringing material and prevent further infringements.

Thank you,

Tom Mullaney
Chair, Uptown Planners, Community Planning Group of the City of San Diego
<<phone>>
Email: tom.mullaney.uptownchair@gmail.com
WHOIS Record for uptownplanners.org

Domain Name: UPTOWNPLANNERS.ORG
Registry Domain ID: D152148151-IROR
Registrar WHOIS Server: whois.godaddy.com
Registrar URL: http://www.whois.godaddy.com
Updated Date: 2021-07-07T00:20:27Z
Creation Date: 2008-03-20T17:24:42Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2022-03-20T17:24:42Z
Registrar Registration Expiration Date:
Registrar: GoDaddy.com, LLC
Registrar IANA ID: 146
Registrar Abuse Contact Email: abuse@godaddy.com
Registrar Abuse Contact Phone: +1.4605243505
Reseller:
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientRenewProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientRenewProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: clientUpdateProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientUpdateProhibited
Registrant Organization:
Registrant State/Province: HCMC, HCMC
Registrant Country: VN
Name Server: NS30.DOMAINCONTROL.COM
Name Server: NS29.DOMAINCONTROL.COM
DNSSEC: unsigned
URL of the ICANN Whois Inaccuracy Complaint Form: https://www.icann.org/wicf/
>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2021-10-23T21:59:36Z <<<

Network Whois record

Queryed whois.arin.net with "a ! NET-149-56-222-72-1"...

NetRange: 149.56.222.72 - 149.56.222.79
CIDR: 149.56.222.72/30
NetName: 0WH-CUST-14903764
NetHandle: NET-149-56-222-72-1
Parent: RG-2 (NET-149-56-0-0-1)
NetType: Reassigned
OriginAS: AS15275
Customer: Private Customer (CO7500482)
RefDate: 2023-02-07
Updated: 2023-02-07
Ref: https://rdap.arin.net/registry/ip/149.56.222.72

CustName: Private Customer
Address: Private Residence
City: London
StateProv:
PostalCode: E14 9FW
Country: GB
RegDate: 2020-02-07
Updated: 2020-02-07
Ref: https://rdap.arin.net/registry/entity/CO7500482
In September, the board charged our committee to review the bylaws regarding elections and to present to the board our recommendations. We have since addressed that charge, including discussing the specific issues that it raised (i.e., electioneering, funding, and conduct of elections).

We recommend against making any changes to the bylaws regarding elections at this time. This is primarily due to scheduling and logistics concerns: Any changes to the bylaws would take months to receive both board and city approval, so they would not be in place for the upcoming March 2022 election. Our committee believes that it would benefit from receiving recommendations from the current ad hoc Election Committee, rather than developing bylaws amendments that might not align with those recommendations. Also, of course, having more time should allow any bylaws changes to be fully approved well before the next election after 2022.

We recognize it as unfortunate that the March 2022 election cannot benefit from any innovations that would modify procedures specified in the bylaws. Because the July 2021 election was an interim election, the board approved special procedures (e.g., multiple voting days). Other changes also have been suggested (e.g., some form of remote voting). However, the bylaws do not allow for those deviations from its explicit requirements for regular elections. We emphasize this because we are concerned about possible challenges to results if any regular election were not conducted in accordance with the bylaws. For that reason, we have corrected elections information on our Uptown Planners website that was not consistent with the bylaws.

We want to clarify expectations, concerns, and options that we have identified as particularly relevant for the March 2022 elections. This is primarily for the benefit of the current ad hoc Election Committee but also for the understanding of board members and members of the public (especially candidates).

The responsibilities of the ad hoc Election Committee are limited to soliciting candidates, publicizing and providing information about the election, conducting the election, counting the votes, and reporting the results. That committee cannot modify election procedures because the city stipulates that our bylaws specify “all procedures” that obtain to regular elections. Reference: CP-600-24, Article V, Section 5.

The Election Committee must conduct its business through public meetings that are noticed in advance. Though language in the city’s administrative guidelines identify exceptions for some ad hoc committees, our Planning Department Representative has confirmed that the public meeting and notice expectations nevertheless apply to our ad hoc committees. Reference: email from S. Mulderig, 10/14/21.

If board member attendance at an election committee meeting exceeds the quorum of the board, then only members of the committee may participate in the meeting. Our Planning Department Representative has confirmed that the Brown Act does not make exceptions for ad hoc committees in this regard. Reference: emails from S. Mulderig, 10/13/21 & 10/14/21.

Multiple candidates may run as a slate. Though language both in our bylaws and in the city’s 2015 administrative guidelines prohibits this, the City Planning Department since has suspended that prohibition, so we cannot enforce it. Reference: letter from M. Hansen, 11/25/19.
We encourage holding a candidate forum at the February board meeting. The bylaws allow for this option, which would, among other things, allow the public the opportunity to question candidates about issues of concern (e.g., slates, funding). Reference: Bylaws, Article V, Section 1.

The Election Committee must consider candidate applications submitted up to seven days prior to the election. This requirement does not conflict with the additional requirements that in February the Election Committee must present a current list of candidates to the board and also that additional candidates may be added at the February meeting. Reference: Bylaws Article III, Section 2 and Article V, Section 1.

Board members are not restricted from commenting on board candidates based on rules that apply to candidates for public office. A complaint concerning the July 2021 election claimed that these restrictions apply to our elections. However, our Planning Department Representative has confirmed that they do not because Uptown Planners candidates are not considered to be candidates for public office. Reference: email from S. Mulderig, 10/25/21.

The election must be held concurrently but separately from the regular board meeting. Our bylaws indicate in one place that the election should be part of the board meeting, but, although the city’s bylaws shell allows this, the city has directed that the shell is incorrect and so, in fact, elections cannot be held as part of meetings. Our bylaws also indicate that nominations can be made from the floor during the board meeting when the election is held. However, as noted above, our bylaws also require that candidates are required to apply at least seven days in advance. Therefore, the section of our bylaws that must prevail is that which indicates that the election should be concurrent with the board meeting. The city has further directed that when elections are held concurrently with meetings, they also must be separate. This does not conflict with the requirements in our bylaws both for a quorum of the board to be present before ballots are issued and for candidate speeches during the election. Reference: CP-600-24 Administrative Guidelines, Section 3 and Bylaws Article V, Sections 2, 5, & 6.

Anyone present may observe the counting of ballots. Reportedly, in at least one previous election, there was confusion and/or mixed messages concerning this requirement. Reference: Bylaws Article V, Section 5 (6).

Thank you for your attention to election concerns. We look forward to addressing a range of potential future bylaws revisions, which we welcome as a continued responsibility for our committee.
Honorable Mayor Gloria and Council President Pro Tempore Whitburn,

Considering recent deaths inside Balboa Park, Uptown Planners ask that the City of San Diego take immediate steps to make roads in and around the park safe for all users. The extraordinary effort to make Pershing Drive safer after the deaths of Laura Shinn and Johnny Sepulveda is recognized as the only appropriate response and we applaud Mayor Gloria for acting quickly and in the public interest. We also recognize that these deaths were unnecessary and additional improvements are desperately needed inside the park to prevent another tragedy.

Uptown neighborhoods are fortunate to have Balboa Park as their closest neighbor. We cherish its institutions and enjoy its open spaces “possibly” more than any other community. It is one of the few public parks accessible to Uptown residents since our community is deficient in public park lands. As such we make the most of its lawns, trails, and roads for recreation.

Balboa Park connects us with other neighborhoods including downtown where we work and play. For Uptown residents who choose to travel on foot, on a scooter or by bicycle it is the preferred route for any trip due to the beauty and uniquely San Diego experience the park provides.

There are so many great things the park has to offer, and it is for this reason that its failures must be addressed. No one should feel unsafe or have their life endangered inside Balboa Park.

While not exhaustive, this list would provide significant improvements to the overall safety of all road users. We request the following.

**Park Boulevard**

An important commuter route to downtown, connection to the park core and the only route for students to reach San Diego High School and San Diego Community College, this fast moving four lane parkway is a critical GAP in our existing bikeway network. Separated bike lanes exist at both the northern and southern edges of the park but the section within Balboa Park remains unprotected. Cyclists and other vulnerable road users are forced to ride in the traffic lane with vehicles moving at freeway speeds. A "Sharrow" is all that is provided and does not offer any protection.

We would like to see a Class IV Protected Bikeway used to close the Park Boulevard GAP. This is consistent with the Balboa Park Master Plan which calls for “Bicycle Pathways” along this route and the Bicycle Master Plan which calls for Class II. Class IV would be compliant with NACTO standards.

Short term, removal of parking to create separated bike lanes would create a much safer connection between Hillcrest/University Heights and Downtown and would be a preferred quick build solution. This would leave four travel lanes for other vehicles.

**Florida Drive**

Another important commuter and recreational route in Balboa Park. The northern section of Florida Drive is narrow with a poor shoulder and NO sidewalk forcing runners and pedestrians to walk in the road. Vehicle traffic moves too fast along this poorly lit and substandard roadway that is used as a cut through to Pershing Drive. It is also scheduled for resurfacing in the coming year.

This road cannot be made safe or upgraded to comply with NACTO standards without sacrificing valuable park land and habitat. It would need to be widened significantly. The Balboa Park Master Plan calls for
this section of road to be closed and reclaimed as park land. Given these two options we support closure of the section north of Zoo Drive to vehicles as outlined in the BPMP. Pedestrian and bicycle access can be maintained, improving access to the urban trails in the area.

The section of Florida Drive south of Zoo Dr. has ample width and opportunity for sidewalks and a protected bike lane. It can and should be upgraded quickly to provide safety for all users.

**Zoo Drive**

A key East/West route through the park and the primary route to Golden Hill and South Park. This steep and narrow road has NO shoulder and NO sidewalk forcing runners, pedestrians, and cyclists to be on the road. Vehicle traffic moves too fast downhill while the uphill is especially treacherous for slow moving cyclists trapped against metal guardrails.

This is another road that cannot be made safe without sacrificing park lands. The Balboa Park Master Plan calls for the future development of Zoo Drive into a four lane connection to Pershing Drive.

In the short term it can be modified to be one-way uphill or downhill which would maintain a connection to Florida Drive while providing room for NACTO compliant safety features. We would like Zoo Drive to be modified to be a safe East/West connection with improved pedestrian access and a protected Bikeway.

**Morley Field Drive**

Another key East/West route through the park and the primary route to Morley Field and North Park. This very steep and narrow road has NO shoulder and NO sidewalk forcing runners, pedestrians, and cyclists to walk in the road or use an unimproved dirt path. This road is treacherous and inaccessible for many users.

Long term, we would like a pedestrian bridge connecting Park Boulevard to Upas Street/Morley Field. This would provide safe and accessible access across Florida Canyon for pedestrians and cyclists allowing families and children to move easily and safely from the park to neighborhoods east. There is currently no safe and direct path for cyclists and pedestrians to connect from the central mesa to Morley Field Sports Complex or North Park.

Short term, improved pedestrian access along Morley Field Drive would be the minimum with safety improvements for all users being strongly preferred.

In closing, we would like to make clear that we understand the challenges these requests present. At first glance they may seem impossible but so too did the Pershing Drive lane reduction. We hope you will see these requests with the same clarity of purpose.

---------------------------

Uptown Planners

cc/
Brittany Bailey
Kohta Zaiser
Molly Chase
Dear Brer,

My name is Keala and I'm a 24 year old woman. I have been living in San Diego for over two years after first moving here to teach elementary school in east county.

I recently began working in education at Balboa Park and I'm thrilled to have a commute within biking distance. Biking to work is one of the many parts of this position that I love, and is often one of the best parts of my day.

From Robinson Avenue, I take Richmond street because it has a striped bike lane, then I turn left on Upas and pass Roosevelt Middle School. I turn right to ride on Park Boulevard for less than a block; I usually choose to divert through the SD Zoo parking lot and then ride down the street just west of the Spanish Village Art Center.

Even with a striped bike lane, the only part of Park Blvd in the area with a Class II striped bike lane, the traffic can be frightening. It often moves fast and very close to bikers. For that matter, I also avoid the Sixth Avenue route to the park for its lack of Class IV bike lanes or even stripes and because the road is so dense with fast-moving vehicle commuters in the mornings and afternoons.

San Diego citizens and visitors will be much safer with Class IV protected bike lanes on Park Boulevard. Park employees, tourists, visitors, and students who attend Roosevelt Middle School or any educational programming there will feel more comfortable getting to and from the park.

Such an improvement in Park Boulevard infrastructure is an investment in the wellbeing of everyone who visits Balboa Park. Thank you very much for reading.

Best,

Keala