

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
July 11, 2023

Directors present, directors absent

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), Jon Arenz (JA), Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Andrew Parlier (AP), Georgia Kayser (GK), Karen Martien (KMar), Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA), Carey Algaze (CA), Anna Bryan (AB), Sasha Treadup (ST), Nancy Graham (NG-City of SD Planning).

1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair. Chair CN at 6:05 pm

CN: Welcome to the UCPG meeting. I am the chair. Tonight, we have a single item on the agenda tonight.

2. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.

CN: Any additions/deletions to the agenda? None raised

- *Adopted by acclamation.*

3. Approval of Minutes: June 13, 2023

CN: Received 2 corrections from RRW. Any additional edits? None raised.

- *Approved by acclamation.*

4. Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report and RC

CN:

- Welcome to the UCPG meeting for July 13th, held in a hybrid format at Alexandria Grad labs building. Thank you to Alexandria for the use of this room which supports excellent hybrid meetings.
- RRW resigned as a board member effective before the meeting as it was easier to advocate for her project without being on the board.
- We have one item on the agenda for approval tonight which is the comment by the UCPG to the planning department on the Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan Update.
- The Torrey Pines State Park ADA/Utilities action item will be on the agenda for the August UCPG meeting, which will be held one week early, on August 1st to accommodate their budgeting process. There will be no August 8th UCPG

meeting. We will also be considering how we will conform to revised CP 600-24, governing planning groups at this meeting.

- I'd like to have RC make his announcement.
 - o RC: I sent an email to the group that I am resigning from the Planning Group. Like a lot of therapists, we're being called back to more practice because of the ongoing mental health crisis. It is a signal to us like a canary in the coal mine that something is really out of line, not only for adults, but also for young people and children. A leading cause of death is overdose and suicides. There are unsuccessful attempts, and for those attempts, there are three that are in serious condition. I feel called to do something, but how I respond is a good question. All of us need to rethink where we are right now. This process on the planet unfolding is a developmental step for humanity out of adolescence into full maturity. And to me that means to take charge for the planet and our own communities. I think we've done really well over the years. I've gotten to know some of you and learned from everyone and we have established a collaborative dialogue and bodes well for the future. It's going into a hurricane but it's a hurricane of conceptual change. The emphasis put on technology in the last couple of months has been thoughtful and specific. We can't let AI happen the way it did with fossil fuels that we can use and integrate into our society. There's been lots of cutting-edge research, which I sent to you. If we look at the inconvenient truths appearing, there are many of them. Not getting as much out of it as we put in doesn't amount to shifting the ground. We are working on a paradigm that's obsolete – hierarchical power. We're going to empowerment of ordinary human beings. Einstein said the delusion of man is they think they are separate. We're connected in ways we might not completely understand. Another curiosity is the strange lights in the sky. After years of denial, ridicule, and false accusations, people are coming forward. We are joining a larger consciousness in the universe. These lights represent a variety of sources – advanced civilizations who hold benevolence for us but not all civilizations are benevolent. We are aided and assisted by those advanced civilizations. There will be an unfolding of disclosures of who and what they are in the next couple of years. They will make themselves known, there will be increased sightings and more military whistle blowers. One of the messages of the of people who have been abducted and the message is clear – we're not good at being stewards of the earth. There's a fundamental connection to everything that exists. Life is the rule in the universe. There is one voice whether a Hindi yogi, Kabbalist, or Tibetan monk – there is one

consciousness, one reality follows specific paths. Going to see emphatic affirmation of that reality that will shift us away from materialistic science and will locate in our being the essence of our consciousness. Our true nature is one with our consciousness, we need to be silent to get outside the narrative. Who we are, why we're here. how we're connected to this consciousness. How we can take advantage to recreate ourselves and our world. I won't be leaving this community for a little bit – perhaps a few years. But will keep in touch with those on the board and will show up and make a comment if there's an item I feel strongly about. I'll still send my emails. I have no agenda other than you grasp who you are, be true to yourself. There is conflict coming, trust yourselves, honor your knowing and your own way of being true to yourself and finding that space of inner consciousness. I'm glad I landed in a great community, not by accident but here to do something together. Collaborative work will continue.

5. Presentations:

Councilmember Kent Lee: Zach Burton

- Zach Burton: A few updates from D6 – the city is undergoing the infrastructure prioritization process. The city planning department launched a new website seeking input from the community on any infrastructure project that you want to see happen in D6 and UC. Also, green bins went out in UC the week of June 20th. We want to be an office available/responsive, even though we don't always agree, want to seek input and make ourselves transparent.
 - o KMar: Do you have a web address to find the infrastructure:
 - Zach: planning.sandiego.gov/planning there is a form on the website.
 - Michaela Valk: We will forward the web address to CN.
 - o CN: We will take up the infrastructure prioritization at our August 1st UCPG meeting to develop a group response and ranked priority list
 - o JS: Question about green bins. When the program rolled out we learned that commercial green bins were being disposed of out of state which seems be a reversal of the intent to save energy. Wondering if you can provide clarification at the next meeting on that?
 - Michaela Valk: Don't believe that's the case, but we can follow up.
 - o Member of the Public: Question on green bins, I live in a 160-unit condo complex and we have only one green bin and none of the countertop bins. Whose responsibility is it to provide those?

- Michaela Valk: Multifamily units are not serviced by the City of San Diego, so I suggest getting in touch with those private trash providers.

Membership Report: Anu Delouri

- AD: The University Community Planning Group is the recognized planning group and is advises the City of San Diego. It advises on planning matters in both north and south University City. Thanks to the efforts of CN and other members who attended the 4th of July event, we got a few new members interested in joining. If you are not a member, please send me or CN in an email.
 - CN: I have another 12-15 forms from the 4th of July event to send you.

Plan Update Subcommittee: Andy Wiese, Chair

- No report given as discussion will occur in agenda item below.

Planning Department: Nancy Graham

- NG: No report other than to say hello and that I'm looking forward to hearing the discussion of the group tonight. Thank you to those of you that submitted comments on the draft prior to the June 30th deadline. We are going through those comments now and we are looking forward to getting formal comments from this group tonight.
 - CN: We should be able to get our report to you in a timely manner.

6. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).

- RRW: I'd like to clarify that I did not provide a reason for resigning from UCPG. I thought my meeting absences may have caused my membership to conclude. I volunteered since 2014 and have enjoyed participating and possibly learned quite a bit in the process. Thank you.
- RC: I have a great story from the 60s to share. Preston, a sound engineer of rock and roll era, worked with all the great bands and he ran the best studio on the planet. Others asked him, how do you get more hits than we do? And he replied that he used subminimal influence. He would add messages like, this is a great record tell your friends, play it until it ran out then buy another one. So, they set up a phone line and released records with a phone number that previously received no calls. After the record was released hundreds of calls rolled into the number. This did not go unnoticed by the military. They used extreme electromatic fields, investigated microwave frequencies and they put that towards community and fights increased. Given what's going on now in politics to influence behavior, is it more likely or less likely that this technology would be used?

7. Action Item: University Community Plan Update. Prepare and approve recommendations on the Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan Update to be included in a Report from the UCPG to the city. The Report from the Plan Update Subcommittee to the UCPG will be used as a basis for this report to the city. Andy Wiese, Plan Update Subcommittee Chair, presenting. Material for this item may be found on planuniversity.org under the July 11, 2023, UCPG meeting.

- CN: Tonight's action item is to prepare approved recommendations on the discussion draft of UCPU and provide a report from UCPG to the city. The report from our Plan Update subcommittee will be used as a basis for this report to the city. AW will present this as an action item. He will make some introductory remarks and will provide an overview of the report to UCPG that was passed unanimously at UCPU Subcommittee. We will take public comments followed by board comments.
- AW:
 - Thanks, CN, for the introduction and to you all for being here tonight. I will provide a presentation of the Final Report of the UCPUS, which has been diligently at work for some time preparing recommendations for UCPG to share with the city. I will then review and discuss the recommendations of the plan update subcommittee.
 - The discussion draft of the plan was introduced on April 11th. The Final Report of the University Community Plan Update Subcommittee [UCPUS] to the UCPG on the Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan (June 30, 2023), was shared with board on July 3rd and it is the expectation that UCPG and audience have had a chance to review the discussion draft and final report and are ready to come tonight with specific feedback related to specific elements of the Draft and to provide recommendations to the full committee and UCPG. The UCPG will adopt its own formal recommendations tonight. The environmental impact process will include opportunities for public feedback. The Planning department and city hope to present a final community plan and EIR to the City Council before the end of this year.
 - Where we've been: we've been engaged in this process for almost 5 years, which started in October 2018 at a community workshop. The subcommittee was selected in October of 2018 and began meeting in January 2019, over 4.5 years ago, working with the city to organize feedback since then. We were promised a 3-year commitment and will have served more than 5 by the time it's all over. We have held over 40 public meetings – both in person and on zoom, due to the global pandemic. The process was dynamic – with 2 different mayors, 3 council members, 3 community planners, park planners, transportation

planners and more. The one consistent public body throughout this process has been the 19 members of the CPUS.

- The CPUS is made up of 10 members of the UCPG with reps from UCSD, Miramar, 6 members at large. 3 representatives from community/business organizations (Friends of Rose Canyon, UCCA and Biocom) who all represent community interests. We have dedicated thousands of volunteer hours. I'll conclude these remarks by thanking everyone who has served as subcommittee member.
- The report reflects the recommendations of the subcommittee. It incorporates thousands of comments received throughout the process. The report represents a balancing act of diverse community interests that include the heart and pocketbook. It won't please everyone but represents the best effort to reach consensus. We have worked to achieve consensus throughout the 4 years, but particularly through the last 3 months with the release of discussion draft and the subcommittee meetings in April, May, and June of 2023. The recommendations in the final report by the UCPUS were approved unanimously. I am especially proud of that.
- I want to spend the next few minutes reviewing what is in the report which is about 47 pages long.
- It begins with an overview of the vision and guiding principles reflecting the many goals the plan has to try to achieve, including support for renowned institutions, a mixed-use urban core, a diversified housing inventory, and maintaining the status of UC's economic center.
- It discusses a few strengths of the draft: steps to meet this vision and principles: new residential/commercial development, fair and equitable housing near transit, improved interface between the UCSD east campus and community, progress towards the climate action plan, improved open space protection, open space dedication for 4 parcels of city owned land, two new linear parks on Regents Road and one on Governor Drive, onsite park requirements for new residential development, onsite public space requirements for new commercial development, with shopping centers that are to be revitalized and not replaced.
- The UCPUS report is organized by topic of consensus and concern: affordable housing, displacement, commercial plazas, density, parks and sustainability, mobility, and implementation.
- The map in the report includes the staff land use scenario with a couple of circled areas showing areas of concern including issues of housing affordability, displacement, and intensity.
- New housing was an area of intense debate and discussion for the CPUS, specifically the approximate doubling of residential units. This potential for new development is on top of roughly 10,000 new beds under construction or complete at UCSD. At buildout, the plan will have more new housing than any other community plan area.

- Housing affordability, including CPUS support for a UC specific affordable housing requirement above and beyond the city requirement, was discussed. The city has engaged a contractor, Kayser Marston, to study this issue.
- Displacement: to protect community serving retail and existing affordable housing, concerns were discussed with Transit Oriented Development as a cause for gentrification and the displacement of the most vulnerable people in University City. This is a nationwide issue.
 - Area marked as A on the map (commercial plazas adjacent to Nobel trolley station): the mixed-use zoning proposed for these plazas unnecessarily puts housing and community serving retail in competition with more competitive uses like biotech/high tech. We are mindful of recent closures of grocery/retail adjacent to Trolley terminus under just such pressure. We have concerns that mixed use zoning would lead to competition which would likely lead to displacement of housing and community serving retail. If the city is serious about housing, it shouldn't lose the opportunity to redevelop these areas with housing and retail/services to support it. The Draft Plan provides abundant space for tech/biotech elsewhere in the plan.
 - Area marked as B in South University (commercial plazas at Governor and Regents, Governor and Genesee): preserve groceries and community serving retail there. The report also recommends preserving lower overall densities and height limits, and adequate building transitions – setbacks, step backs – from adjoining residences.
 - Area C again (southwest corner Nobel Dr and Genesee Ave): concerns about displacement and preservation of affordable housing (and residents) in this area. This is the most affordable housing in UC, and it is targeted for redevelopment by a new very high-density designation (218 du/ac). The plan's goal of a diverse and inclusive community (Guiding Principle #3) is undermined if least expensive housing in the plan area – also the most socially diverse - is replaced with luxury high-rise housing (which is what the market is building in this immediate area).
 - Area D, (UCSD East Campus, Mesa Nueva housing area): we looked at this area as a model for land use density and urban design in the plan update overall – what attractive, affordable, vital, and diverse, high density urban living should look like in UC – that model has a density of 143 du/ac.
- Housing Affordability/Displacement: We went over specific recommendations already, including a UC-wide inclusionary affordable housing requirement (CPUS recommends minimum 15% inclusionary requirement for residential/mixed use projects at 60%

AMI, on site, no in-lieu fees), avoiding displacement of lowest cost housing, anti-displacement regulations scaled to higher cost areas such as UC for affordable *and* moderate rate housing, and lower overall maximum residential densities (143du/ac) to achieve lower costs. The report includes dissenting views including legal concerns for different inclusionary housing standards.

- Commercial Plazas: The report summarizes community concerns with neighborhood impacts, including displacement of community serving retail and services. General recommendations include: lower residential densities and height limits than Discussion Draft, protecting neighborhood retail and services (e.g., replacement of groceries, increase required square footage for community retail - 25% in new development), better integration with adjoining residences (specific set-backs and step backs, use of urban public spaces to buffer and connect with adjoining neighborhoods, mass new development away from adjoining low-rise housing), require off street parking (1 space/du).
 - South UC Plaza (Vons/Sprouts): reduced heights and densities with increased setbacks, incorporate recommendations above. Note: the Urban Design presentation diagrams provided by the city consistently included all of these recommendations, so we request the city incorporate them in the revised Draft Plan.
 - Nobel Campus Area plazas (Whole Foods/Sprouts): we recommend a new height range of 85' to 100', above the Prop D height limit, and recommend zoning of Community Village and not mixed-use (EMX or RMX) to protect housing and community serving retail and prevent competition with biotech/tech uses. We recommend: a provision for neighborhood-scale parks with redevelopment on parcels of this scale, improved bike and pedestrian infrastructure, the same general recommendations as other UC commercial plazas.
- Parks and Recreation: We had serious concerns about this element. The Discussion Draft includes a planned park-point deficit of park and recreation facilities for 49,000 people as well as a planned deficit in recreation and aquatic centers. These deficits persist despite new urban public space requirements, which we applaud. We believe the city should work harder and commit itself to the creation of more park space and hope the discussion draft will include these. The report includes many specific recommendations for park and recreation facilities as well as general recommendations to: re-score parks in the community based on feedback and share the scoring sheets; follow the same standard for urban public spaces in commercial and residential development and count the recreational value for both types; maximize new and existing joint use potentials; develop strategy for neighborhood-scale parks scaled to project size; incorporate strategies

to finance park and recreation infrastructure. A funding mechanism for future parks and recreation infrastructure through something like supplemental funding for parks and/or impact fees, was also suggested. Alternative views on committee included that recommendations were too detailed/rigid and need better balance between public access and needs of R&D tenants.

- Sustainability: The Plan should emphasize the extraordinary natural resources/biodiversity of the place where we are. Report includes specific recommendations to: strengthen policies on protection, restoration, and integration of nature, strengthen the protection of the MHPA, prioritize native trees and landscaping (e.g., specific recommendations for urban forestry – native parkways and corridors – requirements for native landscaping in North Torrey Pines and Campus Point/Towne Centre ‘villages’ – and in parks and urban greening projects), strengthen canyon adjacent development guidelines, prioritize overlooks vs trailheads in ESL/MHPA areas, and protect and enhance watersheds and wildlife corridors.
- Mobility: We support robust, multi-modal transportation to help shift transportation mode share, enhance public safety, and meet climate action goals. We recommend an independent traffic study to prove feasibility of proposals (e.g., Governor Drive and other main thoroughfares), plan to complete a continuous and protected bike system, and prioritize bike infrastructure so critical sections are built. There should be a priority list of bike segments needed. Other specific recommendations, including specific financing plans.
- Implementation: how the plan will be paid for and built. A fundamental planning principle is that growth must be supported by infrastructure, however, our plan lacks a framework for providing the infrastructure and facilities needed to make this plan work and to make future growth possible. Recommend: study and incorporate additional strategies for building needed infrastructure (similar to K-M study of inclusionary housing); consider “Future Opportunities Fund” and enhanced SDRs for parks, bike lanes and other infrastructure.
- I’d like to offer a motion:
 - *MOTION*:
 - AW: Approve and adopt the Final Report as presented and direct the chair to update the report as recommended by UCPG including any amendments adopted as a group and that this report would include alternative and dissenting views.
 - 2nd to motion by CU.
 - CN: Request an amendment that the UCPG recommends and directs the subcommittee chair, the author of the subcommittee report, to author the final report.
 - Motion revised and accepted by the seconder.

- JS: I think it is important to be clear as to whether UCPG is supporting the dissenting views, rather than just noting what they are. Adopting the final report including recommendations of UCPG and each section following these recommendations there would be dissenting views that could be expressed there. What concerns me is some readers will think that we're in support of dissenting views rather than just noting that they were there.
 - AW: The report is the UCPG recommendations, with alternative views from the CPUS deliberations also reflected
 - JS: I'm saying that we are merely noting the dissenting views and are not accepting the dissenting views as the views of the UCPG.
 - AW: Accepted as friendly amendment/2nd CU.
 - Current Motion: UCPG recommends the approval and adoption of the Final Report as presented and directs the subcommittee chair to update the report as recommended by UCPG including any amendments made by the UCPG, including a statement that the dissenting views are provided for information but not accepted by the UCPG.

Public Comments:

- Rebecca Robinson Wood: Appreciate the presentation. Talking about Gilman Drive Corridor Plan, presented one if you could put up on the screen. Might be a misunderstanding on Gilman Drive to La Jolla Village Drive. Existing land uses south of UCSD are commercial visitor, residential detached SFD, apartments, schools, synagogue, electric transformer station. The vacant 3-acre city owned space. Plan expands and provides buffer to class II bike lane on Gilman Drive. Proposed land uses for the site would be residential-low, residential-medium, alternative land use might be urban flex. Encourage land use for the area.
- William (Wil) Moore: Policy Council for Circulate San Diego. We have monitored and participated in process. We heard a description of the lengthy process - this method of community input is biased against younger and working families - who saw rents skyrocket. The community survey is unbiased because it most accurately represents the demographics of community – over 50% voted for densest option A, do not needlessly pass the housing crisis onto the next generation.
- Charlie Frasier: UC resident for 47 years, subcommittee worked long and hard to come to consensus. Applaud subcommittee for most of the recommendations. One exception is the mobility section. It is fine for young

athletic people who are not elderly and do not have disabilities and can ride bicycles. For some of us who cannot do that, adding bike lanes affects their ability to enjoy the community.

- Steven Bossi: Representing the La Jolla Village Square property. We submitted a couple of letters highlighting areas we agree with and areas of concern. We support urban village land use because it presents redevelopment opportunity with multimodal transportation options, would provide mixture of uses and much needed residential uses.
 - CN: Thank you for those comments, it is nice to hear from you and have you participate.
 - Steve Bossi: I would like to clarify for the record that I have attended and participated in previous meetings as well.
 - CN: Understood, the record will reflect that.
- Tom Mullaney: The subcommittee did excellent work. I attended some of the meetings and they had a broad attendance. Scaling back total density is extremely important as they don't have any idea how to provide the needed public facilities. Democracy should be for the people. If the community started with their own plan, we wouldn't land anywhere near where we are now. Population growth has slowed down or reversed. I recommend you contact your council members and stress that the plan needs to be scaled back to something more reasonable. The city council and mayor think they understand planning, but do they? They dumped park standards and FBA. And the impact fees won't be spent in the community where they are generated. There's enough capacity right now for huge growth for at least 30-50 years. I recommend you approve and adopt the report, but I recommend you clarify you are not approving of the plan, unless these revisions are made. If you approve the plan, subject to the conditions, the conditions get lost.
- George Lattimer: As a past member of UCPG and chair, and developer of commercial and residential projects in south and north University City, I had pleasure of serving on subcommittee, and was impressed and pleased with what AW has done with draft. But my comments are (1) the plan sorely lacks the financing mechanism that was in the 1987 plan which had an FBA and an infrastructure plan. The city has no mechanism to do that now – I urge city to develop such a plan (2) the question of increasing inclusionary requirement for residential, economically, will create a disincentive to build in this community (3) Concern that singling out particular properties that because you provided low/moderate income housing we will penalize you and require you to retain that housing is unfair for people who have provided a service. They should get the same zoning as others. (4) 2 properties on the west side of I-5 at Nobel should get the highest density possible as they are the best sites to develop in University City, where Trader Joes market is, has been zoned in the previous plan as a regional mall set up for same density as UTC. There is no reason to not allow the same density – we should be in favor of more development there as it has the trolley site and a freeway interchange.
- Jay Zyernia: AW thanks for running another coordinated and well thought out meeting. I'm a 24-year resident living on Genesee Ave. The EIR is also a

significant step in the process as what they believe will be practical. Does that provide us with an opportunity to engage and think about it properly?

- NG: This draft you are commenting on is the very first draft which is why we put it out to get comments on it. The 2nd draft that comes forward will come forward with a draft environmental impact report showing the impacts associated with the plan. With the 2nd draft will be an environmental impact report which offers a public comment process so we will again solicit comments. Individuals can submit their own responses. Then, when it goes to hearing there is a final impact report it has adjustments based on public comments.
- Laurie Phillips: Member of subcommittee representing the biotech community. Concerned with schools in the region given the increase in population. Wondering if the submission ought to elevate that as well as recreational facilities.
 - AW: Do you have recommendations on specific language?
 - Laurie: Just a specific recommendation is that we ensure adequate schools for increased population without requiring students be bused to neighboring communities.
- Jeff Dosick: Concerned about mobility bike lanes, having moved into UC after '87 (current Community Plan). I've been bike commuter to work, 2 lane bike paths built since '87 and funded were great but have been chopped up and are unusable for most people and that's not recognized. If we don't have viable funding, nothing will happen. Needs to be addressed and funded.
- Debby Knight: I am also on the subcommittee; I'd like to thank Andy profoundly for his work on this and agree with Joanne that it should be clear that these are the group's recommendations. There were dissenting opinions, but these are the recommendations. Second, there is no "there, there" in terms of actually building bike infrastructure and parks. The City is not beginning to meet their own goals on the Parks Master Plan update. Because they are upzoning all parcels they are giving millions away to developers and are not requiring that the parks be provided - that their own new Parks Master Plan requires for the number of people. Is the EIR going to look at VMT in theory with bike infrastructure built? How will VTM be analyzed in EIR.
 - NG: It is designed to address project components; we don't pull components out of analysis - the plan is the land use plan and mobility plan. Analysis is done on land plan and mobility plan. We need to analyze impacts of changes to mobility system as well as changes to land use system, the way we analyze it includes both. It assumes projects are there since they are part of the plan.
 - DK: So, there will be no funding to build the infrastructure but the analysis assumes it will be built?
- RC: We are in a structural catch 22, a country that's a social democracy, a system of social support that leads people to be confident that retirement is seamless, but we don't have that social support, so people want to accumulate wealth by homeownership. High density options with no home ownership are not attractive to people starting families. They will want a community,

schools, amenities, so they will commute on quality of life and accumulating wealth. The high-density option is what got us into trouble in the first place – more, more, more, build, build, build at expense of quality of life and relationship to nature. Young people: you're not here to be entitled to have a comfortable lifestyle in University City. You are here to see the consciousness of humanity for a new version of yourself. Don't sell your souls.

- JS: Did not appreciate, until recently and until George explained, how critical the financing problem is. The difference in '87 plan is that it provided for financing. Now we may be left with a plan that is somewhat hollow because financing may never come to pass. How can we work implementation into this?
 - NG: The City, about a year ago, made a decision at the city council that we are moving to city wide fees rather than community fees. Cities across the country use city wide fees. This was the decision of the council that they are not doing community specific fees any longer. They decided to do that because they had millions of dollars that they could not spend because it was not enough money in small pots to build the infrastructure projects. The change gives them the ability to pool funds to get projects done faster. This was adopted by the council, but this was a pretty recent decision, that's the implementation guidance that I have to work under.
 - Michaela Valk: I know the next meeting you will discuss the infrastructure/priority survey, but I don't want you to think that you won't see this funding in the community. The neighborhood services first set of funds of citywide park fee included Mercy Park getting \$800K. It needs to be approved by council but those dollars are going to University City.
 - CN: The FBA also has \$43M it has not spent.
 - Michaela: Those FBA funds can't be used in another part of the city.
- KMar: I have a few comments on the subcommittee report – I'll start by saying I love this report and think it's fantastic, so thank you to the subcommittee and city staffers who organized this process. I agree with so much in this report and will call out a few things I was happy to see:
 - Setback and step back increases
 - Community village zoning for the Trader Joes and Whole Foods plazas.
 - Native tree parkways
 - Max density should be 145 du/ac, but I don't agree with how its implemented. I don't agree with community land use scenario where it is scaled down at all density everywhere, I prefer to reduce the areas that are colored darkest purple at 218 reduce to 145 du/ac. The community scenario reduces housing *too much* relative to the staff proposal. A bigger concern than affordability is climate change. People commuting in and out of the neighborhood every day: either make it easier to get here without driving a car or increase housing that

is here so people can live where they work and go to school. Need to do both things: get here by mass transit and live here as well.

- I don't agree with:
 - Comment about unbundled parking: I understand the concerns that it is trying to address, but don't want to put in housing without enough parking and have streets overflow. Unbundling is not the right way to go. Make cost of parking transparent. The 1 parking space per unit won't solve the problem either. We should unbundle parking but combine this with other parking management strategies.
 - I don't agree with George's comment about treating properties differently. Properties across the plan are zoned differently depending on their circumstance. The north side of Nobel (west of Genesee) faces Nobel and the mall but the other side (southwest corner Nobel/Genesee) faces low/medium density residential housing and residential street that has been called out in the plan as a bike boulevard. It's not fair to say these properties are the same and the SW corner should get the highest density level.
 - Don't think we should require a traffic study before the plan since it's impossible to do.
 - Implementation: look at the mechanism of adding maintenance assessment district to finance mobility improvements and parking districts.
 - AW: Some of these comments could be amendments to the motion. I could accept some amendments as friendly, like potential strategies for the city to pursue such as a maintenance assessment district. I wouldn't require a traffic study before the plan is finalized but I do not think it's too much to ask that the EIR include a transit study if they undergo transit changes. It doesn't feel like we need to include that. Unbundled parking: I'm happy to entertain more conversation about that, without new spaces, parking for new development will take place on the back of communities and surrounding streets. This could be included in dissenting views. I suggest not including parking issues as a friendly amendment since it's so complicated.
- GK: I strongly support changes submitted by the subcommittee, very grateful for their efforts and the work of the city helping us through the plan update process. After following the process and listening to community members, some items were said again and again, and I want to make sure I said them again. Things I've heard again are max 143/145 du with affordable construction, height limits in south UC (Vons/Sprouts plazas) that don't exceed 4-5 stories, 10 stories is too much to absorb. There was some discussion about construction and lower rise buildings having lower cost

construction, making it easier to have more affordable/moderately priced units, and community serving retail must be preserved to help meet needs of community and climate goals of the city. I want that commercial space preserved. Lots of discussion about how parking could be bundled or unbundled for new residents. I don't want all parking taken away. Some parking needs to be preserved for residents. I want safer pedestrian bike areas since we don't have them now. Parks and rec and school capacity need to grow proportionally to new population growth. Need to have some of those fees help with school capacity and new parks and recreation areas.

- ST: I appreciate the neighbors and subcommittee members that voiced support for the subcommittee plan and acknowledge and plan for denser community that maintains quality of life. I lost my grocery store, which was within walking distance, but I support the plan to conserve those features if in modified ways, with infrastructure for bike lanes and parks a big priority. Neighborhood scale parks are important. Opportunity for expansion is really critical, and I endorse a lot of those features.
- LB: Thanks again, Andy. Speaking to other community members, it's much appreciated. When the survey came out it had limitations for many reasons, and it started a lot of contention. It was the starting point for the community to respond and understand what was going on for the community. A lot of people did not complete the survey because the density of all the choices was so high. Those that weren't completed for community members were not counted. I'm very confused as to how we got to the discussion draft from the survey to what we have now as high rise. I'm pleased that Michaela has gone around our neighborhood. I want to come to a reasonable place and worked very hard to do so. My greatest hope is this Report is not window dressing and is indeed to change the staff recommended plan. I ask about retail shopping centers if the change in zoning for retail is required with residential or an option. I want to make sure we don't lose more supermarkets. What happened to the Hyatt Hotel? We are losing restaurants there. About the \$43M in the FBA, how will it be used? will it go into the plan? We have ADUs in the community so there will be more density with these ADUs as well.
 - AW: Zoning for plazas allows for both community-serving retail and housing. Can't be easily addressed in zoning but can be in policy recommendations, which could require replacement of groceries.
- CA: First, like to thank Andy and the subcommittee for your effort on this report and for the discussion of the group. We've heard a lot of good points today and I really appreciate the time and effort spent having such a robust discussion. So, representing the Business District 2 I am considering how this all would impact the business community and in doing that I note that the Number 1 priority of the Plan update is to support a thriving economy, so it is important to consider the impact of these recommendations on economic development of the community. I am also evaluating this with my experience in land planning and land development. I am most interested in adopting a plan with sound planning principals and one that implements the city's climate action plan goals and encourages high density around transit so that

we can capitalize on our transit investment. Unfortunately, I have a hard time supporting this motion as it includes spot-downzoning of parcels in transit-oriented areas and also can introduce additional barriers to entry for housing development with affordable requirements that exceed city wide requirements. While the alternative views are presented in the report that discuss some of these concerns, they are not the recommendations of the report. So, for these reasons, I won't be able to support the motion tonight.

- KMar: Dissenting views of consistent zoning is potentially still consistent with zoning (the plan includes many different properties with different land uses and zoning). A traffic study needs to study those changes. I do want to discuss unbundled parking and would like to see recommendations to strengthen discussion in the community plan about other ways to deal with parking in the planning area. Will it be a drop on the bucket of what we need here? The plan does mention community parking districts, and I would like to see the UCPG add a recommendation for community parking districts to be strengthened and an actual statement in the plan that parking districts should be pursued to mitigate parking impacts.
 - AW: Plan policies: 3.9 page 178 – 3.9A support parking management strategies to increase turnover and reduce overnight parking, include creation of parking district.
 - KMAR: I suggest a dissenting view on zoning equivalently the residential lots south of Nobel versus north of Nobel. And a change of 3.9A on page 178 to consider on-street parking permits in areas of SFD, and community parking districts include low density areas.
 - NG: The plan doesn't need to say this to do a parking district - that's a huge decision and not one you'd want to make on the fly, and what's written is to explore them. If the group wants to take up and explore this as a future issue, it doesn't have to be written into community plan to have a parking district.
 - CU: This is a long, complex discussion. We have a wonderful report that includes a lot, and we should table the discussion on parking to another time.
 - JS: Concept of studying and considering it is fine, but I would argue that we should do something now that could happen over 15-20 years.
- IK: Thank you for the work of the subcommittee and planning group – thank you for the work on the urban forestry section. There is lots of wording about protecting and restoring, but only a few references to acquisition. Also, I propose edits to the recommendation to complete the connection between Coastal Rail Trail and Carmel Valley Bike Path to mention Old Sorrento Valley Road. I second that what George says about pedestrian safety and health is really important.

- **FINAL MOTION:**

UCPG recommends approving and adopting the Final Report as presented and directs the subcommittee chair to update the report as recommended by UCPG including the amendments made tonight:

- *The report will include a statement that the dissenting views are provided for information, but not accepted or recommended by the UCPG.*
 - *Recommends pursuing additional strategies for funding improvements – including maintenance assessment districts and community parking districts.*
 - *Add land acquisition to list of efforts to protect and restore open spaces and wildlife corridors. 4.2L*
 - *SR -56 Bike Path – reference to Old Sorrento Valley Road*
- *Motion Carries: Yes-10, No -2, 1-Abstain.*
 - *Abstention by AB as this is a 5-year process and she is new to the board.*

- 8. 9:20 Adjournment: Next Meeting will be on August 1, 2023, in-person at 9880 Campus Pointe Drive, third floor, Terra Nova Conference Room. This will be a hybrid meeting in-person and on Zoom. This meeting is early at the request of the State Parks System Capital Improvements Department to obtain a recommendation for the Torrey Pines State Parks utilities and ADA improvements project. This will be the only August UCPG meeting.**