



16/18 project for planning commision

From Scott Menzies [REDACTED]

Date Tue 12/16/2025 3:55 PM

To Maples, Hunter [REDACTED] >; Tomko, Jonathan [REDACTED] >;
Hadri, Cynthia [REDACTED] : Sirwaitis, Sherri [REDACTED] ; Barton-
Holmes, Christine [REDACTED] ; Escobar, Manuel BC <BC
[REDACTED]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Please include this in the backup.

Thank you for your time.

I am writing to address the ongoing lack of basic project information and the insufficient engagement Pleasant Hill Collaborative has had with this community.

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting as it is my wife's birthday, but I am writing to follow up with the Planning Commission regarding last night's Urban Renewal Board meeting and the continued communication issues surrounding the 16/18 Block development.

RHNA has experienced a frustrating and inconsistent communication process. We requested basic information—building height and massing, number and type of units, affordability levels, parking, zoning considerations (including prior references to HT or student housing), site plans, unit sizes, retail counts, and public or community benefits—but were repeatedly told the project was conceptual and that all relevant information was contained in the orange diagram.

As a result, the neighborhood was asked to engage without access to essential details, while later being characterized as having been "engaged." The project advanced to the Urban Renewal Board despite the absence of meaningful information.

I also reviewed the backup materials and the statement from a member of another neighborhood, and this is the first time, as RHNA President, that I have heard of this level of support from another neighborhood. In contrast, RHNA has had only one meeting with the developer, and no community questions were answered. Both RHNA and the Planning Commission need clear, basic information to make informed decisions—particularly given the Urban Renewal Board's own confusion about apparent errors in the documentation.

Our concern is not that projects evolve, but that "conceptual" has been used to delay sharing baseline information while still claiming community engagement. Engagement without information is not meaningful.

RHNA raises these concerns not to oppose development, but to emphasize the need for timely, transparent, and meaningful engagement. We have agreed to a standing agenda item with the development team to improve communication. Our goal is not to delay progress, but to ensure an informed process and a better project for everyone.

Scott Menzies

Robertson Hill Neighborhood Association President



CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook.

For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "[REDACTED]".