



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Group Meeting
December 7, 2021

***** APPROVED January 24th, 2022 *****

In attendance: Helen Rowe Allen, Mary Brown (left before vote on item IV.2), Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom
Absent: Michael Brennan, Bill Smith

I. Call to order. (6:03 pm)

1. Introductions

2. Agenda

Mat Wahlstrom: Meeting schedule too long.

Matt Medeiros: Why Save San Diego Character when already presented on NAVWAR? Tom Mullaney: NAVWAR did not present then. Members wanted to hear both sides.

Lu Rehling moved to refer Carbon Health item to Design Review Committee and Protect & Plan item to Capital Improvements. Second: Christopher Cole.

Brer Marsh, Tom Mullaney, & Mat Wahlstrom: Carbon Health is for internal tenant improvements, so not appropriate for Design Review and business needs decision soon. Protect & Plan presenters: Ok to defer their presentation.

Christopher Cole: Amend motion to defer consideration of Protect & Plan item only.

In favor: Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom

Opposed: Helen Rowe Allen, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt

Abstain: Mary Brown (because missed motion)

PASSED: 9-3-1

Amended agenda passed unanimously.

3. Meeting minutes for 10/25 & 11/2

Helen Rowe Allen: 10/25 minutes should show abstained from approving September minutes on grounds of not attending. Object to use of first names only in 11/2 minutes.

Motion to approve 10/25 minutes:

In favor: Helen Rowe Allen, Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Mary McKenzie, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom

Abstain: Stuart McGraw, Matt Medeiros (both not present)

APPROVED: 11-0-2

Motion to approve 11/2 minutes:

In favor: Helen Rowe Allen, Mary Brown, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Roy Dahl, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Lu Rehling

Abstain: Mat Wahlstrom (not present)

APPROVED: 12-0-1

4. Treasurer's report

Mary Brown: Bank balance \$150.65. No change (no charge for two sets of checks). Supporting documents include city guidelines for funds available. If any suggestions for use, email Mary Brown.

5. Committee reports. None

6. Community Planning Committee Update

Tom Mullaney: Two CPC information items on agenda. City cites legal requirements for proposing to make Community Planning Groups more independent and self-governing, which would involve replacing current bylaws.

7. Verification of attendance

Tom Mullaney: Option of using chat window.

II. Representatives of elected officials

Abbey Reuter from office of County Supervisor Nathan Fletcher: Information about how to obtain booster shots. County providing kits to help reduce opioid overdoses. Information about Mobile Crisis Response teams that provide emergency mental health interventions and support. Blue Line trolley extension now open.

Barbara Cosio-Marino from office of State Senator Toni Atkins: Information about fiscal outlook and budget priorities. Senator met with US VP Harris.

III. Non-agenda public comment

Lu Rehling: Correction to statement made at last meeting that committees are not allowed to request information from the city without board approval: Board approval only is required before committee recommendations go to the city. Any committee or individual can request information from the city.

IV. Action items

1. NAVWAR

Presenter from US Navy: Greg Geisen, NAVWAR Project Manager

Presenters from Save San Diego's Character: Patty Ducey-Brooks and Sue Treton

Links to both presentations at end of minutes.

Public comment:

Clifford Weiler: Concerned that because of tidal mudflats and alluvial conditions, buildings should not be too tall. Based on recent court decision, still 30-foot maximum. Concerned about residences so close to military facility. Concerned about projected I-5 traffic backups.

Bob Daniel: Navy requested postponement from Coastal Commission to 2022. What will be different in next application?

Michael Donovan: Navy has provided updates since February 2020. Support concept/urban density. Environmental and tax base benefits.

Sharon Gehl: Support project for environmental reasons. What Navy presentations done and what organizations support?

Paul Jameson: Support project. Need housing near transit. Work together to find solutions.

Janet O'Dea: Problem with developers versus communities deciding project parameters. Units proposed may be inconsistent with federal and state climate action plans.

Valerie Norton: What are plans for children and schools and for recreational areas, parks, playgrounds? Navy should consider lower density options.

Matthew Brown: Regarding traffic and commuting, need partnership to identify what will work for everybody in all areas.

Amanda Nelson: Great project. Re: climate change, will happen over three decades along with other projects that will help to ease concerns. Provides more car-free opportunities.

Lisa Mortenson: Concerned about traffic. Need choice to drive and not penalize those who need to. Housing for Alternative 1 should be for military housing that encourages community, not high rises.

Rob Contin: Concerns about project: Selling off property designated for defense means special responsibility to work with community. Need compromise alternative that meets Navy needs and is sensitive to history of Navy and city.

Board comment:

Mat Wahlstrom: Alternative 1 misrepresented as not fundable. Should not allow speculators to profit off of public land. Demands of housing military personnel are greatest pressure on regional needs. Navy-Broadway complex is example of promised public benefits not realized.

Roy Dahl: Concerned about federal government redeveloping site as new mini-downtown. May not provide enough parkland. Need traffic studies (versus vehicle miles traveled).

Mass transit use of current employees on site? People need cars not just for commuting.

Matt Medeiros: Support building area up. Project needs to specify military housing to encourage nearby live-work. Need mass transit near housing. Opportunity to put hub in place. Economic boost to city.

Brer Marsh: Support project for housing, commercial space, and mass transit. Need in Uptown. Grand Central project may move downtown. Concerns about traffic do not recognize needs of others.

Christopher Cole: Not enough variety in Alternatives 2 – 5. Navy should work not just with developers but also all interested parties, so project can adapt.

Lu Rehling: Under-analyzed impacts and blank check for developers. Concerns: environmental impacts, parks, open space, schools, affordable and military housing, mass transit unknowns. Alternatives 2 -5 provide less space for Navy facilities. Historic facilities possibly could be re-purposed. Why Navy not seek government funding or more modest public-private options?

Mary McKenzie: Need to know more about climate impacts, including flooding. Not enough involvement in discussion. Not about personal preferences or views but sustainability within scope proposed.

Gail Friedt: Put aside housing for military. Would cybersecurity facility allow for more cyber attacks?

Helen Rowe Allen: Concerned about impacts on business and tourism. How 30 years of demo and building will affect is problematic.

Clint Daniels: All alternatives secure location? EIS shows parkland and schools.

Engineers know how to evaluate vehicle miles traveled. Engineers can solve problems with flooding but not tail pipe emissions from cars, which has greater climate impacts.

Support workforce and military housing. More customers better for business.

Tom Mullaney: Urban planning should be multi-step iterative process with reasonable check. Population would be equivalent to Coronado which is 5 – 7x larger; 50% higher density than Manhattan. Traffic is not personal problem; slowdowns add to pollution to greenhouse gas emissions. Navy should consider smaller scale development with less height with military housing and continued community input.

Responses:

Greg Geisen: Engagement with community groups. Early in planning process. Decisions about mixed family housing, parks, schools, retail, traffic to be determined. Federal land, so Property D requirements regarding height limits do not apply. New facilities will include even stronger cybersecurity. Still working out issues with Coastal Commission.

Agreement with SANDAG is non-binding information sharing, so independent projects. NAVWAR may or may not include transit center or central mobility hub. Over 100 meetings with community groups and those will continue.

Sue Trebon: At what described as beginning of phased review process, what commercial developers and organizations involved? Greg Geisen: Listed several community groups.

Patty Ducey-Brooks: Making presentations and hearing comments is not active involvement. Closed door process; need as many people as possible incorporated in process. Need to be realistic about needs to support population before end product.

Board:

Matt Madeiros: Move not to take action. Range of individual positions and not necessary to adopt formal board position. (Tom Mullaney ruled that no action not an official motion.)

Lu Rehling: Important for board to weigh in on issue because of potential community impacts. Move to support Save San Diego's Character in its efforts to continue to communicate with the Navy about developing alternatives in a way that better addresses community needs and concerns. Second: Mary Brown.

Gail Friedt: Move to table matter and let Navy come back as things progress. (Agreed with Tom Mullaney that not a separate motion, just an opinion opposing Lu Rehling's motion.)

Mat Wahlstrom & Steve Cline: Two motions open.

Matt Madeiros: Rephrase his motion: Move to table matter.

Tom Mullaney: First hear from all members.

Brer Marsh: Favor Matt's motion. Board should not align with group with unknown political purposes.

Steve Cline: Second Matt's motion. Too early in process for board to take formal position.

Christopher Cole: Impressed with Midway-Pacific Community Planning Group's letter to Navy about project. If we do something, we should present letter asking questions to Navy.

Tom Mullaney: Vote on Lu's motion.

Matt Medeiros: Need to vote on his motion first. Mat Wahlstrom and Steve Cline: Agree; motion to table takes priority.

Vote on motion to table indefinitely:

In favor: Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Stuart McGraw, Matt Medeiros

Opposed: Helen Rowe Allen, Roy Dahl, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Lu Rehling, Mat Wahlstrom

APPROVED: 7-6-0

2. Carbon Health – Urgent Care

Ed Hoban from Carbon Health: 2700 SF development at the HUB in Hillcrest. Link to presentation in Supporting Documents at the end of minutes.

Bob Daniel: Someone should move to approve as presented. Tom Mullaney: Appropriate to have comments.

Mary McKenzie: Similar to Perlman Clinic? Risky market? Ed Hoban: Competition in every market.

Mat Wahlstrom: What coordination with trauma unit hospitals? Shane Herbert (Carbon Health): Outreach with all emergency room and hospital partners to be able to organize transportation. Also works in reverse.

Steve Cline: Move to approve as presented. Second: Matt Medeiros.

Lu Rehling: Impact on community and on parking? Ed Hoban: Not heavy parking use.

Mary McKenzie: What business taking over? Relationships with hospitals formalized?

Shane Herbert: Will set up relationships after in place. Ed Hoban: Previous tenant closed over a year. Mat Wahlstrom: Was The Knot Stop.

Helen Rowe Allen: Business model outside our purview.

APPROVED: Unanimous

BREAK

3. Election Committee

Steve Cline: Presented background since Election Committee met regarding upcoming planning group reforms. May require refinements to election plan down the road but not proposal for upcoming March election. Goal to allow Uptown Planners to have multi-night voting again as in July. Proposed amendments (provided in Supporting Documents link at the end of minutes) need approval by 2/3 of board members present and then by city.

Tom Mullaney: Slides different from memo in Supporting Documents.

Steve Cline: Memo what would go to city (with correction of typos).

Public Comment:

Sharon Gehl: Urge support.

Ernie Bonn: Concerned with how will work with changes to planning groups which will be coming up again at next CPC meeting.

Board comment:

Mary McKenzie: Questions: One vote per household. Need to happen every year?

Steve Cline: Proposed CPG reforms will require complete rewrite of bylaws. Proposed language seems to suggest one vote per household. Could be hard to enforce. Issue down the road. Not clear whether plan approval required every year after reform process. City does nothing fast. Not before summer.

Lu Rehling: Potential reforms irrelevant for March election. Concern about timing.

Does not completely accord with shell, so potentially additional layer of review. Need to get solid information to public far enough in advance, especially for in-person or in-print campaigning. Proposed changes incomplete or inconsistent with existing bylaws and guidelines. Also ambiguity regarding installation of new members. Too open-ended for Election Committee and would require board approvals but unclear if not

approved. Changes proposed not adequate. Steve Cline: Does comport with guidelines; language already approved for Ocean Beach.

Matt Medeiros: Recommend approve bylaws changes now. Could amend to address concerns raised. Changes would provide safer, more open election with improved participation that city should approve.

Helen Rowe Allen: Move to accept Elections Committee proposal. Second: Roy Dahl.

Tom Mullaney: Should vote on them separately. Helen: Bylaw changes on first two pages.

Tom Mullaney: Should not be approved today. Typos and other inconsistencies and conflicts. If bylaws will need overhaul, no need for cleanup or planning for future elections. February 1st would be too late for board to decide. Voters should not have to provide both identification and proof of residency. Memo paraphrases bylaws and there are conflicts, for example, designee language would allow business owners to allow any non-residents to vote and conflicts with proxy voting prohibition. New concepts and interpretations are problematic. Would support single change to multi-day voting and try to get approved by city early enough to give information early enough. Requires majority vote of elected members.

Mary McKenzie: Want to see slide of each motion. Mat Wahlstrom: Agree.

Lu Rehling: Past time for adjournment. Point of order and not appropriate to carry on after 10 pm. If continue, should have way to attend to details raised, especially with changes to policies.

Steve Cline: Typos and residency issues are in election plan not bylaws under consideration.

Tom Mullaney: How get board's election plan approval far enough in advance.

Steve Cline: Can approve bylaws and election plan now. Have to submit no later than January 10th.

Mary McKenzie: Question was called. Mat: Agree. Lu Rehling: Vote on calling the question? Tom Mullaney: No. Only speaker who has floor can call question.

Vote on proposed bylaws changes:

In favor: Helen Rowe Allen, Stephen Cline, Christopher Cole, Clint Daniels, Gail Friedt, Brer Marsh, Mary McKenzie, Matt Medeiros, Tom Mullaney, Mat Wahlstrom

Opposed: Roy Dahl, Stuart McGraw, Lu Rehling

APPROVED: 9-3-0 (Tom Mullaney: Meets 2/3 requirement.)

Steve Cline: Election plan typos to be corrected: January 10 is 45 days from first day of voting; February 1 for meeting date; name should be Hillcrest-Mission Hills Library; valid identification card showing current address OR valid identification and proof of residency; eligibility should be owner or business designee; preceding 12 months (not year). Also need to authorize Election Committee to present to city.

Mat Wahlstrom: Move that if the majority of Election Committee approves the corrections then can present to city. Second: Matt Medeiros

Tom Mullaney: Election Committee will have one or more noticed meetings between now and January 10th? Steve Cline: At least one.

APPROVED: Unanimous

Mat Wahlstrom: Motion to table information items and adjourn. Second: Helen Rowe Allen
Tom Mullaney: December 16th (date corrected by Mat Wahlstrom): Special meeting of
Planning Commission to discuss ADUs. January: Subcommittee meeting of CPC to
discuss changes to planning groups.

APPROVED: Unanimous
Adjournment, 10:16 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted by Lu Rehling for Mary M. McKenzie, Secretary

NAVWAR presentation:

<https://uptownplannerssd.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021-12-07-NAVWAR-OTC-Revitalization-Navy.pdf>

Save San Diego's Character presentation:

<https://uptownplannerssd.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/NAVWAR-Presentation-12.7.21-v2-Save-SD-Character.pdf>

Supporting documents for agenda:

https://uptownplannerssd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SupportDocs_12721_UP.pdf

Filename: 2021_12-07_Minutes_FINAL_UptownPlanners.pdf