Mid-City Communities Plan Update

Working Group Existing Conditions Meeting Summary

MEETING DETAILS

June 26, 2024 – 6:00-8:00 P.M.
The Salvation Army Kroc Center
Community Room
6845 University Avenue, San Diego, CA 92115

The meeting was conducted in a hybrid format allowing participation in-person and via Zoom.

BACKGROUND

As a part of an inclusive engagement process, the City has convened a Working Group for the Mid-City Communities Plan Update. The primary role of the Working Group is to inform the Mid-City Communities Plan Update process. Additional details can be found by reviewing the *Mid-City Communities Plan Update Working Group Protocol and Membership* (April 16, 2024). In addition, an orientation was held for Working Group members on April 24, 2024, to encourage members to make connections with other members, and inform the Working Group on what to expect of their role and timeline of their involvement. The City published the *Mid-City Atlas: Existing Conditions Report* (*Mid-City Atlas)* online on June 14, 2024.

PURPOSE AND GOALS

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the *Mid-City Atlas*. During the meeting, the City presented key information from sections of the *Mid-City Atlas* and Working Group members were encouraged to share their comments and provide feedback related to the report. The Working Group provided comments and feedback, highlighted notable findings, identified key issues, and discussed whether information in the *Mid-City Atlas* accurately reflected what they had observed in their community.

WORKING GROUP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

A total of 15 Working Group members attended the meeting, with one member absent. Eleven Working Group members attended in person, and one attended virtually. In addition to the Working Group members, there were 22 members of the public that attended the meeting. Eleven members of the public attended in-person, and 10 attended virtually. The Working Group meeting was supported by City staff and consultants supporting the City including staff from Ascent and Imagine.

Table 1 - List of Attendees

Working Group	Attendance	Community
Nam Nguyen	In-Person	City Heights
Randy Torres-Van Vleck	In-Person	City Heights
Steve Aldana	In-Person	City Heights
Brittany Nicole Poggiolo	In-Person	City Heights
Victor Ponce	In-Person	City Heights
Angelica Rocha	Absent	Eastern Area
Eric Kelley	In-Person	Eastern Area
Zach Young	Virtually/Zoom	Eastern Area
Kristen Spittle	In-Person	Kensington-Talmadge
Lisa Stone	In-Person	Kensington-Talmadge
Madeleine Baudoin	In-Person	Normal Heights
Thomas Aristide	In-Person	Normal Heights
Marcellus Anderson	In-Person	Designee - City Heights CPG
Lynn Edwards	In-Person	Designee - Eastern Area CPG
David Moty	In-Person	Designee - Kensington-Talmadge CPG
Emilie Colwell	In-Person	Designee – Normal Heights CPG
Project Team	**Attendance**	**Affiliation**
Alexander Frost	In-Person	City of San Diego
Apharna Padmakumar	In-Person	City of San Diego
Selena Sanchez Bailon	In-Person	City of San Diego
Veronica Alatorre	In-Person	Ascent
Christine Babla	In-Person	Ascent
Matt Gelbman	In-Person	Ascent
Isaac Ing	In-Person	Ascent
Paul Kronser	Virtually/Zoom	Ascent
Catherine Hanna Schrock	In-Person	Imagine
Peter Schrock	In-Person	Imagine

City Planning Department

MEETING SUMMARY AND ACTIVITIES

At the beginning of the meeting, staff welcomed Working Group members and the public to the meeting and Working Group members were encouraged to share their names, and which community they represent. Introductions were also made for City staff and team members. Food was provided for members of the Working Group. The meeting started with City staff giving a presentation summarizing the *Mid-City Atlas*. Working Group members actively engaged in discussions, through a facilitated discussion on the "Introduction," "History and Place," and "Sustainability, Climate, Equity, and Resilience" chapters. Working Group members were asked questions after a presentation on the chapters. The questions used to prompt discussion are shown in Figure 1 - Discussion Questions. Key topics from the Working Group's discussion and comments from members of the public are summarized in separate sections that follow.

Figure 1 - Discussion Questions

DISCUSSION

Working Group First Round: Answer one of the below
- Anything that stands out to you?
- What resonates with you?
- Any surprises?
- Does the report content match what you are observing in your neighborhood/community?

Any clarifications or questions?
Accuracy of text, charts, names, maps, etc.

Working Group Second Round (time permitting)
- Any ideas on how to improve this section of the report?
- Is there anything missing that we should explore further?
- Are there any additional things happening in your community that we should be aware of?

sandiego.gov

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION TOPICS

The main feedback provided from Working Group members related to the "Introduction," "History and Place," and "Sustainability, Climate, Equity, and Resilience" chapters, and included the following:

1. **Changes in demographics and housing:**
   - The population decline was surprising for many and the potential factors that caused it, including the downzoning in the 1998 Mid-City Community Plan and building schools where housing was once, among other factors, were discussed.
   - Although most of the community consists of multifamily housing, it is not affordable.
   - Income has not kept pace with rising housing costs.
   - Concerns about the decline in young residents and the need for family-friendly neighborhoods.
   - Mid-City data should be compared to citywide and statewide data for a better perspective on changes in Mid-City, relatively.
   - Post-pandemic growth has been significant in Mid-City.

2. **Affordability concerns and housing availability:**
   - Affordability is a critical issue and Mid-City has become significantly more expensive.
   - There are fewer residents, yet housing costs have risen simultaneously.
   - More housing is needed throughout Mid-City, with discussion about how increasing housing supply might not necessarily lead to cheaper prices.
   - Incentivizing developers to build and sell at lower prices remains a challenge.
   - Young families struggle to afford to buy, while older residents can't afford to leave.
   - There are more renters than homeowners; with the increase of housing costs, many are now focused on renting in San Diego and not necessarily owning.

3. **Tree canopy and shade:**
   - Mid-City needs more trees, especially City Heights and Eastern Area, and equity considerations are crucial when considering tree coverage.
   - New projects being built often lack trees or the trees are so little they do not provide sufficient shade.
   - Native tree planting should be proposed but avoid palm trees since those do not provide shade.

- o Shade structures, not just trees, can help mitigate heat, and other shade options besides trees should also be explored.
- o Trees are often planted in homes but not along corridors, therefore walkability does not benefit.
- o Removal of trees alters ecosystems, affecting wildlife like coyotes and increasing their presence in urban areas.
- o Fire safety and flood concerns persist due to inadequate planning and maintenance.
- o Bioswales can also be used to help irrigate new trees during the rainy season.
- o Near El Cajon Blvd tree coverage decreases as you get closer to the major corridor, leading to increased heat due to asphalt absorbing sunlight.

4. **Mobility, transportation, and emissions:**
   - o Concerns about missing sidewalks, especially in Eastern Area, hinder walkability.
   - o Automobiles should be considered as a mobility option and planned for like other modes of transportation, including addressing parking needs.
   - o Electric cars will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
   - o There is no light-rail service in Mid-City today, and transit is a planning decision.
   - o Mid-City needs to be a place that is safe to walk and bike; and traffic violence and pedestrian collisions are concerning.

5. **Concerns related to equity:**
   - o Climate conditions intersect with affordability and transit policies.
   - o Low-income communities face higher traffic collisions.
   - o There have been new trees planted but those were efforts by community members and homeowners that are willing to maintain them.
   - o The rising temperatures pose risks, especially for vulnerable populations sensitive to heat.

6. **Other observations:**
   - o There's a huge opportunity to make positive changes through the update.
   - o The removal of trees on Adams Ave, Manzanita/Swan Canyon by Azelea Park, does not help.
   - o Lack of sidewalks in Eastern Area near University Ave needs to be addressed
   - o El Cajon Blvd and University Ave need more trees if we want people to walk.
   - o Review report data: Adams Ave is excluded from the TPA Map.

City Planning Department

Members of the public provided additional comments in person and on Zoom after the presentation and Working Group discussion. Members of the public attended the meeting. A summary of the verbal comments is included in the list below. Members of the public were also able to provide written comments; in-person attendees could submit a comment card, and the virtual attendees were able to use Zoom chat. The comments provided through Zoom chat are included as Appendix A – Record of Comments Provided through Zoom Chat, and the comment cards from the in-person attendees are included as Appendix B - Comment Cards Submitted.

1. **Housing, density, and accessibility:**
   o All neighborhoods should have at least two entry and exit points.
   o There's an excessive number of short-term rentals in the area.
   o People shared different perspectives on the connection between density and property values.
   o All types of housing should be included in the plan.
   o Truly affordable housing (30-50% AMI) is needed for seniors, disabled individuals, and low-wage earners.
   o Creating more affordable home ownership opportunities for younger generations by constructing "starter homes" of about 1,200 SF.
   o Consider diverse age groups living in Mid-City.
   o Consider diverse cultural groups living in Mid-City, such as Mexican, Somalian, Ethiopian, and Vietnamese communities.

2. **Tree Planting, Sustainability, and Climate plans:**
   o Have a deliberate approach to growing and planting trees.
   o What does the new Climate Action Plan and Vision Zero entail for Mid-City? Are there annual steps to achieve the goals?
   o The City should address flood and fire issues along Aldine Dr.
   o Strategic placement of drought-tolerant landscaping in underutilized narrow spaces.

3. **Mobility and infrastructure improvements:**
   o SB 969 may impact walkability and reduce public space by allowing restaurants to pop out into street.
   o Consider how active walkers can cross canyons more effectively.
   o The city needs to address sinkholes.
   o Mobility practices beyond automobiles, emphasizing transit and biking.
   o Public transit in Mid-City is inadequate; explore successful models from other cities.

- o Increase the number of local destinations within walking distance of residential areas.

4. **Other comments:**
   - o Colina del Sol would like a community garden to address various issues, including homelessness.
   - o Create opportunities for community activation and collective ownership in public spaces.
   - o Improving school quality in Mid-City can encourage residents to stay.
   - o Wages need to increase in order for people to continue to live in Mid-City.
   - o Address employment centers, universities, intellectual capital, and higher-income jobs.

5. **Questions, Clarifications and Feedback on Accurate Reporting:**
   - o How does the geographic area of Mid-City compare to the broader San Diego area? (Heat index)
   - o The Euclid Avenue Revitalization Action Program should be incorporated as part of the Mid-City Community Plan Update.
   - o The communities of Webster and Ridgeview are two separate communities and should not be referred to as Webster/Ridgeview.
   - o How was the Working Group committee assembled?
   - o Additional edits and comments on the *Mid-City Atlas* were provided through a physical copy of the document.

NEXT STEPS

- Next Working Group meeting is September 11, 2024. It is anticipated that the meeting will continue with the discussion of the *Mid-City Atlas* and will begin discussion on the Mid-City Communities Plan Update Public Engagement Summary.
- Public Engagement Summary is planned to be released in late summer.
- Existing Conditions Mobility Assessment is planned to be released in Fall 2024.
- Historic Context Statement & Survey is planned to be released at the end of 2024/ early 2025.

APPENDIX A – RECORD OF COMMENTS PROVIDED THROUGH ZOOM CHAT

Person 1: Hi Everyone, Lorna Zukas, El Cerrito, I serve on the El Cerrito Community Council, I'm a sociologist by training with experience in urban planning.I am a homeowner and I fully support keeping single family neighborhoods and not mixing single homes with multiunit housing. I think we need to plan for electric cars rather than no cars. Parking is mandatory in my mind. When we don't provide enough parking, we hurt people with fewer economic means who live in multiunit housing areas.

Zoom Host: Thank you for the input, Lorna!

Person 1: Clearly we have to get incomes up to solve the problem.

Person 1: Didn't population decline?

Working Group Member: I wonder if the downward population trend is due to a downward trend in family size? i.e. less kids?

Person 1: How many single family homes and how many multiunit homes have been built in mid-cities from 2000 to 2022? Also how many new parks and recreations areas have been built to support new housing? The actions that the City has taken in the last five years have given rise to huge increase in land value and thus housing prices.

Person 1: Zachary, the demographic shift is real. A lot of people are staying at home much longer than previous generations, people are staying single longer. However, by age 40 people are getting married and often starting families. When they do this they want houses.

Person 1: Let's use the Vienna model. They have developed a good social housing model.

Working Group Member: One problem with affordable housing is its always rentals! an affordable condo is few and far between, most dont qualify for the easiest loans to get (FHA backed). I would love to see more family sized condo units, I would have loved to have bought a three bed 2 bath condo, but they dont exist in the middle income range.

Person 1: Replying to "One problem with aff..."
This is so important Zachary; when one owns they gain accumulated wealth from property rather than subsidizing someone else's profit.

Person 1: Interesting question! Immigrant families are likely to have larger families. Senior house holds are more likely to be smaller, unless kids move home. It would be nice to have this type of data.

Working Group Member: Replying to "One problem with aff..."

Agree 100%. With the growth in housing prices too, it seems to me the bottom rung of that wealth-building property-ladder has moved beyond Single Family homes. Townhomes, Duplexes. Small to Midsize Condo buildings with 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms for young families are going to need to be that bottom rung in the future.

Working Group Member: Replying to "One problem with aff..."
Ideally we can do that with infill development. but I imagine there is more demand than paving parking lots can fill

Person 1:   Replying to "One problem with aff..."
Yes, but we have to get rid of the ADU bonus plan that is encouraging developers to buy the affordable homes, put apartment buildings on them and then charging market rate housing for all but 1 or 2 units.

Person 1:   Can't hear.

Working Group @ Kroc Center: We are moving forward with presentation on the next section and will get to discussion on two topics and once in the interest of time.

Working Group Member: I would have liked to see College Avenue also called out as a transit/mobility corridor

Person 1:   We are losing trees to ADUs. This has to stop.

Person 2:   The problem with densification or infill development is that it raises land prices astronomically. Here are links to two studies that show the impact of densification policies: http://www.demographia.com/dhi.pdf and https://fortune.com/2024/06/16/housing-market-crisis-impossibly-unaffordable-cities-california-feudalizing-land-home-prices/. The last is an article in Fortune magazine, of all places. From the article: "The report points to 'urban containment policies' that are meant to limit sprawl and increase density. Those have resulted in higher land prices, which have translated to dramatically higher home prices, it explained.The trend toward increasing density was geared toward reducing reliance on cars and freeways, improving gridlock, and making neighborhoods more walkable. But the report said while such policies were well-intentioned, they resulted in land prices being eight to 20 times higher in urban containment boundaries than outside of them." The Working Group might consider these points of view.

Person 1:   How do these numbers break out by age?

Person 3:   Is this session only for the folks in the Working Group sharing their thoughts on the draft report from the City.Or will community members have a chance to also share theirs too?

Working Group Member: When you design for cars. People drive cars. That's why 80% of us use cars. I commuted downtown for 3 years on bus and trolley. I bike to the local shops. We only have one car and my partner works 25 miles away. Trolleys and buses are very much needed and utilized!

Zoom Host: Hi Jean-huy tran, at the moment it is just Working Group members and shortly we'll have a public comment period.

Working Group @ Kroc Center: Replying to "Is this session only..."
There will be a chance for members of the public to provide comments - online and in-person - at the end of the presentation and discussion by Working Group members.

Person 1:   I've been commenting on issues as the discussion progressed. I hope these are considered part of public comment.

Person 1:   Agree Ron Anderson.

Person 1:   It sounds like this speaker is describing the need for social housing.

Person 1:   The college/Rolando library is going to lose its parking due to increased density on the adjacent property. The City is giving up City property to a private developer. This is a major problem for the College, Rolando, and El Cerrito areas. We drive to the library and won't be able to park. Public transportation to the library is long and arduous.

Person 1:   We need to make sure that our recreation facilities are all functional. The pool at Colina Park is not open yet this summer due to a broken heat pump. This may not be a planning issue, but keeping the facilities that are built in working order is important.

APPENDIX B – COMMENT CARDS SUBMITTED

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

membership needed *add to draft*

Pg #8	kroc + YMCA were "privately" built
10	large bldg is in College Area see border on pg 36
11	Polish, add the "h"
13	ch Cr watershed is NoT in Normal Heights see pg 54
14	College Area Plan not relevant — remove
18	not "Valley" (that's South of 94) it's in the "Watershed"
18	bottom right photo — caption is wrong
20	grammar either Spain/Mexico or Spanish/Mexican
23	*add* Normal Heights lost homes when 805 was built
23	Coll.Grov. Shopping is in Eastern not outside see pg 74
23	Little Saigon is in Ken Tal *add* also (north side of EC
33	Ch H. Navy already historic / neon majorette sign also
33	← their not eligible → they are already H *stone pilla are*
42	Talmadge gates are not on Marlborough
46	need definition of "Env. Justice Communities"
49	average age of "walkers"? 20yrs vs 80yrs?
54	Normal Heights is in the SD River watershed
	omitted the 2016 Aldine flood + 2019 fire
	please add the recent flood + fire in KenTal

H|

Please provide your contact information below.

[redacted]

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City Communities Plan Update below.

PLAN MID-CITY — Communities Plan Update

(margin, top) need membership

(left margin, vertical) River acres where are the Chollas Watershed acres?

pg # ☆

where are the

56 health issues / listed in summary where's data

58 bottom right / photo caption wrong

60 lists heart disease + diabetes ☆ where's the data

← 62 does open space include Chollas Lake or just canyons?

63 2 Rec marked are private Kroc + YMCA require membersh

78 % for both or totals for both — mixing confusing

81 how can Aldine be a collector w/ no curbs sidewalks? 4/3

83 SDSU should be added to the map

84 Monroe is planned ECB is done

96 futsal not soccer

97 Rolando Park joint use is built not proposed

97 more fixes to figure 6-1

98 bottom left photo caption wrong

Appendix A+B r figure 6-1 needs work !!! ..

(left margin, bottom) #2

Please provide your contact information below.

[redacted]

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

I would like to see improved walkability
In Talmadge there is little to walk to. I walk
a lot but for exercise not to do errands or
go places.
I would like to see more interest in looking
at the future + less emphasis not preser-
~~ving~~ ving the present/past.

I'm pessimistic about our facing the need to
reduce CO_2 emissions given our reluctance
to increase density + improve public transportation

In my opinion, leaders are not making an argu-
ment for increased density. A dense area makes
for a more stimulating city — and offers more
diverse opportunities for employment, cultural
institutions, etc.

Equity — The well-to-do communities want to redirect
                                        usually poorer neighborhoods
increased density to other areas — whereas some
research shows lower income people benefit by
living in more affluent neighborhoods.

Please provide your contact information below.

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

PLAN MID-CITY
Communities Plan Update

Affordable Housing
- Housing development that is 90% luxury units & 10% "affordable" (majority) units (@ 80-100% AMI aka 90k) is not what we need
- We need housing developments that are majority affordable and truly affordable (30% AMI, 50% AMI ~ for low wage earners & disabled/elderly folks on fixed incomes)
- A LOT of $ the city funnels to affordable housing basically creates profits for wealthy landlords when we pay high rents for low income families + individuals (Section 8 + other housing vouchers) and also provide housing incentives w/ double or even triple deposits etc.
  → More of that $ should be invested in permanently affordable units subsidized by the city
- Let's talk about how the city can build or incentivize contractors to build or redevelop properties to create truly affordable (not luxury) units that maintain the character of our communities, prioritize equity, & acknowledge the human dignity of ALL our neighbors (especially disabled + fixed income folks + low wage earners who are most vulnerable in the housing crisis.)

Please provide your contact information below.

[redacted]

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

HOW CAN WE BE SERIOUS about AFFORDABLE
housing when WE ARE DISCUSSING INCREASING
RENTAL units by TEARING DOWN SINGLE FAMILY
OWNER OCCUPIED houses. EVERY house that is
TORN DOWN AND REPLACED by RENTAL MULTI/UNITS
IS ONE less home that can be put on the MARKET
AND SOLD to THE YOUNGER GENERATION. THE ONLY ONES
WHO CAN AFFORD DEMOLISHING A SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE
AND REPLACING IT WITH A MULTI story 10 unit
APARTMENT COMPLEX ARE DEVELOPERS. DEVELOPERS
DO NOT build FOR charity. THEY WANT TO MAXIMIZE
profits. WHAT is DEFINED AS AFFORDABLE RENT IS
A JOKE out of MOST peoples GRASP. THE City is
not MAKING housing EASIER to ATTAIN but actually
HARDER. San Diego stopped building STARTER homes
DEFINED AS 1,200 SF S.F.R.S IN THE LATE 1990's
THE MAYOR + THE COUNCIL should AS A CONDITION OF
APPROVAL REQUIRE DEVELOPERS To Build A HIGH
PERCENTAGE OF 1,200 SF. S.F.R.S within their
MCMANSIONS OF 2,500 SF + UP SO THAT THE MIDDLE
CLASS CAN AFFORD TO buy AND STAY IN SAN DIEGO

Please provide your contact information below.

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

City Heights is one of the most culturally
diverse areas in the state. We have large Mexican
samalian, ethiopian vietnamese populations.
3 hope the community plan will
consider their interests too.

Please provide your contact information below.

Comment Card

Please share your comments about the Mid-City
Communities Plan Update below.

PLAN MID-CITY
Communities Plan Update

▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ / I LIVE IN 'COLINA DEL SOL'- DIRECTLY ACROSS FROM COLINA DEL SOL PARK & RECREATION- I'M REPRESENTING MY CONDO COMPLEX (PARKRIDGE CONDO'S) • THE MAJORITY OF HOMEOWNERS IN MY COMPLEX WOULD LIKE THE CITY PLANNING GROUP TO INCLUDE ADDING A 'COMMUNITY GARDEN' FLOWER/SUCCULENT GARDEN SPECIFICALLY TO THE FRONT AREA OF THE PARK ALONG ORANGE AVE (AT 52ND STREET) TO THE PATH AT THE TENNIS COURTS;

WE ARE PLAGUED BY A HOMELESS 'ELEMENT' THAT IS A PUBLIC NUISANCE DAILY- MAKING LOTS OF UNNECESSARY NOISE, FIGHTS, URINATING IN PUBLIC IN BROAD DAY LIGHT, TOTALLY DISRESPECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD & COMMUNITY. THEY REFUSE TO MOVE TO THE BACK AREA OF THE PARK — 'PARKS' & REC HAVE TRIED IN MANY WAYS TO GET THEM TO MOVE - NO SUCCESS. SO THE COLINA DEL SOL COMMUNITY GROUP HAS COME UP WITH THE IDEA OF MAKING THAT ENTIRE FRONT PART OF THE PARK A BEAUTIFUL FLOWER, SUCCULENT GARDEN /COMMUNITY GARDEN/ TO CREATE A DROUGHT TOLERANT LANDSCAPE THAT WILL MAINTAIN THE BEAUTIFUL VIEW WE LOVE AND ENJOY AT MY COMPLEX AND HOPEFULLY FINALLY RECTIFY THE GROUP OF PEOPLE BEING A PUBLIC NUISANCE. FORCING THEM TO MOVE TO EITHER THE BACK OF THE PARK OR JUST GOING AWAY ONCE AND FOR ALL ⟶

Please provide your contact information below.

I'M ONE OF NUMEROUS HOMEOWNERS IN COLINA DEL SOL
AND WE HAVE ALL AGREED THAT CREATING THIS COMMUNITY GARDEN
IS ONE OF THE BEST LAND USE IDEAS FOR COLINA DEL SOL PARK.
THE PARKS & REC DEPT. ARE WELL AWARE OF THE ISSUES ALONG ORANGE
AVE AT THE PARK, AS ARE THE SDPD. — TOGETHER WE
ALL FEEL THAT DEVELOPING THIS FRONTAL AREA INTO A
GARDEN THAT WE CAN ALL CONTRIBUTE TO AND HELP MAINTAIN
TOGETHER AS HOME OWNERS, RESIDENTS AND WE ALL THAT ARE
CONCERNED THAT THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE MAKING A PUBLIC
NUISANCE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD UNSAFE FOR THE CHILDREN AND
ALL OF THE SURROUNDING SCHOOLS AS WELL AS EVERYONE
WHO IS AFFECTED BY THEM DAILY, WEEKLY, MONTHLY, YEARLY.

(COLINA DEL SOL PARK IDEA)

• CONVERT THE ENTIRE FRONT GRASSY AREA
    TO BE A COMMUNITY GARDEN, FLOWER GARDEN,
    SUCCULENT DROUGHT TOLERANT AREA FOR
    THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO ENJOY AND BE
    ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO —

APPENDIX C – PUBLIC MEETING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions and Answers

The following questions, clarifications, and feedback were submitted by public members during the June 26 Working Group meeting via comment cards.

How does the geographic area of Mid-City compare to the broader San Diego area? (Heat index)

The City of San Diego is located in a Mediterranean climate (Köppen climate classification Csa), it is only slightly less arid than a desert receiving just over 10 inches of precipitation a year. Like many urban areas, San Diego is facing the effects of climate change. While the annual mean temperature is only 63° F (17° C), the city is still subject to extreme heat events with temperatures exceeding 104 °F (40° C), particularly in late summer. Rising temperatures from climate change further exacerbate the urban heat island effect.

A region that had high heat exposure and heat risks includes the communities of Mid Cities, Eastern Area, and College Area. These regions are further away from the ocean and so people living in these regions do not receive the cooling effects that people who live closer to the coast do. These regions also have high impervious surfaces and low tree canopy, one reason being that the regions include Interstate 805 and Interstate 15. These regions have high populations with health conditions along with other factors such as absence of health insurance, people of color, and people over the age of 65.

The analysis presented in the Mid-City Atlas is based on the research in the following link. The heat exposure maps indicate that these census tracts were in the 80th to 100th percentile of high heat. For more information, please refer to
https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/d79916f065424f1a91c3663cb486a126

How was the Working Group committee assembled?

The City Planning Department received 72 entries in total (70 English and 2 Spanish applications), receiving applicants from all four community plan areas. The selection process for choosing Working Group members included:

1. City staff reviewed applications for completeness, collated and anonymized the information for 64 applications.
2. Ascent Environmental reviewed the anonymized applications and preselected 12 applicants based on location, age, household income, living arrangement and experience.

3. Pre-selection applicant list reviewed by City staff. City Planning Department Staff verified preselected applicant backgrounds via internet search (LinkedIn, etc.) to prevent multiple representations of applicants from one organization.
4. Selected applicants were contacted by City staff to confirm their commitment to serve on the Working Group and were provided with Working Group Roles and Responsibilities.
5. Once all selected applicants confirmed interest to serve on the Working Group, City staff:
   a. Drafted and posted the Working Group Protocol and Selection Process on the project webpage.
   b. Sent emails to notify those that were not selected and provided a link to the Working Group Protocol and Selection Process.
   c. Sent the eblast to the project newsletter to announce the selection of Working Group. Please find the below link for more information: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2024-07/working-group-protocal-membership-and-selection-process_final-1.pdf

How can we be serious about affordable housing when we are discussing increasing rental units by tearing down single-family owner-occupied houses? Every house that is torn down and replaced by rental multi/units is one less home that can be put on the market and sold to the younger generation. The only ones who can afford to demolish a single-family house and to replace it with a multi-story 10-unit apartment complex are developers. Developers do not build for charity. They want to maximize profits. What is defined as affordable rent is a joke out of most people's grasp. The City is not making housing easier to attain but harder. San Diego stopped building starter homes defined as 1,200 SF S.F.R.S. in the late 1990s, and the mayor and the council should, as a c... of approval, require developers to build a high percentage of 1,200 SF. S.F.R.S. within their MC Mansions of 2,500 SF + HP so that the middle class can afford to buy and stay in San Diego.

Through the Mid-City Communities Plan Update process, the City will look at how to address present and future housing needs in Mid-City, given housing is a critical component of the quality of life for all residents.

For decades, the rate of construction of new homes within the City has not kept pace with demand creating high housing prices for the existing housing stock. Despite the overall increase in Mid-City household income, the median home value has grown by 2.7 times more than the median household income in Mid-City. Between 2000 and 2022, median home value increased by 384% compared to a 142% increase in median household income.

Increasing the amount of built housing units in Mid-City creates additional homes for Mid-City residents. Multiple-unit developments are not limited to only for-rent apartments, they could also result in for-sale homes. The City acknowledges the current need for home options for first-time homebuyers, families with children, and middle-income households and is currently working on the "Small-Scale Neighborhood Homes Initiative" to address the need for townhomes, rowhomes, and small-scale multiple-home buildings. This is also a topic the City will look at through the Mid-City Community Plan Update process to specifically address housing needs in the Mid-City communities.