

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 16th, 2023

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room
6949 Genesee Ave, San Diego, CA 92122

5:30 p.m. to 8 p.m.



PUBLIC NOTICE AND AGENDA

*NOTES:

- This event will be in-person at the University City High School – Media Center/Library Room located at 6949 Genesee Ave, San Diego, CA 92122.
- The Subcommittee **Meeting will begin promptly at 5:30 p.m.** and end at 8 p.m.
- Order of agenda items may be modified at the beginning of the meeting at the discretion of the chair.
- **PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS IN ADVANCE:**
- **The Community Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan (onscreen or print version):**
- Onscreen Plan: <https://webdocs.sandiego.gov/public/ucpu-cdd-onscreen-reduced.pdf>
- Print Plan: <https://webdocs.sandiego.gov/public/ucpu-cdd-print-reduced.pdf>
- **A video presentation of the Community Discussion Draft by Senior Planner Nancy Graham from the UCPG meeting of April 11, 2023 can be found here:**
- Presentation Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nO2GbzMlpo>
- **Working Matrix of Public Comments – attached.**

5:30 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 21, 2023 and April 18, 2023 Meetings
(minutes can be found with Meetings material at Planuniversity.org)

5:35 Overview of Meeting: Topics, Expectations for Conduct

Andy Wiese, UC Plan Update Subcommittee, Chair

Chair Andy Wiese will provide an overview of the topics to be covered in this meeting, including the community plan update process and timeline. A spreadsheet with itemized comments received from the October, November, February, March and April meetings is attached to this agenda with the expectation that meeting participants will add to this comment spreadsheet. The intent is to use this spreadsheet to provide specific feedback to the City of San Diego on the Discussion Draft of the Community Plan as the basis for discussions by the UCPUS in June. Chair Andy Wiese will discuss the expectations for conduct by the public for this meeting.

5:45 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: One minute per speaker

6:00 Comments on Discussion Draft of the University Community Plan – Topics: Land Use, Mobility (continued), Parks, Urban Design *Andy Wiese, UCPUS Chair will moderate.*

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 16th, 2023

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room

6949 Genesee Ave, San Diego, CA 92122

5:30 p.m. to 8 p.m.



Using the comment spreadsheet as a working document, the subcommittee and community may provide comments on the Discussion Draft of the Community Plan - Land Use and Mobility (continued) in addition to Parks and Urban Design. **Especially useful will be specific suggestions not already represented on the spreadsheet.**

8:00 Adjournment

Meeting must conclude by 8:00 p.m.

Subcommittee Meetings are open to the public. Agendas and meeting summaries can be found at: www.planuniversity.org/meetings

For further information regarding agenda items or sub-committee meetings, please contact: Andy Weise awiese@sdsu.edu .

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 16th, 2023

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room

6949 Genesee Ave, San Diego, CA 92122

5:30 p.m. to 8 p.m.



Non-Agenda Public Comment:

- Public comment will be taken during the meeting, or ahead of time via email submission. If you would like to submit a non-agenda public comment, please either email your comment to awiese@sdsu.edu before 2 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21st, which will then be read aloud by the UCPUS Chair, OR request to speak during the non-agenda public comment portion during the meeting.

Agenda Item Feedback & Discussion:

There will be several opportunities for feedback and discussion during the meeting. There will be dedicated opportunities for verbal question and answer.

Attendees can provide comment either during or after the meeting by:

- Speaking during public comment;
- Submitting written comment at the meeting (comment cards will be made available) and/or

Sending emails to the project team. Please submit written comments to planuniversity@sandiego.gov; with CC to awiese@sdsu.edu.

Comment	Identifying Information					
	Comment Type	Date	Location	Site specific	Housing	Open Space
University Community Plan Update Subcommittee, Summary of Public Comments Oct, 2022-May, 2023						
CPUS meeting, October 18, 2022						
Provide visual examples of densities (note: see examples in September 2021 meeting materials)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
Support middle/lower income housing.	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
All want to support affordable housing - go into process with caution - not sure what will be built - address with specificity	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
SW Corner Nobel/Genesee: Move to a lower density - avoid displacement of renters in lowest cost apartments; incorporate displacement protections; make sure replacement maintains adequate stock of affordable units	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UTC - Nobel/Genesee	1	1	
Land entitlements - and value increases - are guaranteed - not infrastructure/parks. what other things are/aren't guaranteed? What from the plan will be implemented?	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Focus land use changes in the focus areas (not outside of them); specific parcels can be discussed, but stick to what's been surveyed	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Concern re: family-sized units (3-4 bedrooms) - need densities that accommodate this	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
All of the purple shaded areas (mixed use) allow zero housing units. Some should require housing (RMX)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
Require on-site affordable units - not in lieu payments	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	

Plan needs Middle income housing - reflect real needs - incl affordable housing that mirrors need of community; set preferences that embody needs (20-30-40%)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
Protect residents from displacement; new affordable units should be built on site (no in lieu fee)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
Max density should be 143 du/ac - some areas should be zoned for high density residential (not mixed use) to ensure that housing is built	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	
Concern with lack of infrastructure to support future growth. Planning process needs to look at infrastructure/facilities now - not down the road (parks, open space) to support whatever is to be planned - e.g. parks deficit - now 1.3 acres/1,000 residents - where is the space for parks?	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	1
Protect open space and MSCP lands; setbacks/height limits near canyons; minor spaces - overlook and linear parks next to Rose Canyon; limit to 143 du/ac; leave space outdoor rec (no in lieu pyts); no displacement of renters; on site affordable housing	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	1
Designate what are private v. public parks - include on-site recreation for new housing - recreation fields on new commercial properties should be open to the public	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	1
Setbacks/height limit near MHPA and canyons	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			1
Creation of overlook/linear parks - may be one of the few opportunities for parks +	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			1
Community parks - land is very expensive - must have satisfactory space (not "postage stamp" parks)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			1
Canyon edges should not be high density or high rise	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General		1	

Outdoor recreation spaces have to be included on site for all residential development otherwise concern re: not built	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			1
No displacement sw of Gen and Nobel - least expensive rental housing. Replacement housing there should be low-rise, without displacement	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General	1	1	
Cars - units w/o parking - public parking garages + permitted street parking	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Consider goals of parents w children: no rezone of SF, - walkable to daily needs, small and affordable restaurants, access to parks, access to beaches, access to faith-based places; preserve retail at SUC plazas, retain current setbacks, heights and parking. New residential must include rec space, higher density near Trolley - 5 stories - less farther then 1/2 mile.	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General	1	1	1
Preserve height limits at shopping plazas	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Look at what's financially possible re: infrastructure - what's necessary for a vibrant community	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
High rise does not equate to high cost	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Height limit - if given equal density/intensity - can be more sustainable, efficient, and occupy less land area; varied heights can have more visual interest	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Height restrictions currently exist in overlays	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Urban Village - key only indicates residential changes - how does it change the commercial component?	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			
Take into consideration UCSD's plans for the future - will affect traffic	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UCSD			
Campus Point - cul-de-sac problem - residential concerns (one way in/out); consider second access/egress	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Campus Pt-T	1		

Remove condos (between Campus Point and Eastgate Mall - east side) from rezoning	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Campus Pt-TCtr	1		
Focus Area 4 - Villa La Jolla and Gilman Drive - upzoned? Why are we doing this? Limited by coastal height limit	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Nobel-Campus	1		
South of Nobel - remove rezone of condos - La Jolla Colony	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Nobel-Campus	1		
Community park is behind JCC	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UTC	1		
Church (SE corner of Genesee and Eastgate Mall) - continue existing land use	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Campus Pt-TCtr	1		
East of I-805 - restricted industrial - what might go over there to serve population (retail, etc.)?	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Miramar	1		
Concern re: West of Genesee - East of Regents - between Decoro and Nobel - most affordable rents in UC - mixed use zoning would have towers/displacement; just 10% AH doesn't reflect needs of community	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UTC	1	1	
Excalibur Way - revert back to single family (outside of focus area)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UTC	1		
Incorporate public open space into Rose Canyon	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	South UC	1		1
No rezone at SW corner of Governor and Regents. It's a church. Not discussed or studied previously	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	South UC	1		
East side of Regents - Visitor Commercial - why?	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	UTC	1		
Focus Area 5 - Greenwich Drive - currently commercial office space and not near transit/transportation options - add to GHG emissions - remove from changes	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	South UC	1		
Where are the outdoor park spaces? Area west of 5 - not near Nobel Park (soccer & rec center)	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	Nobel/Campus			1
All MSCP and open space lands - provide full protection	Subcommittee Comment	10/18/22	General			1

Start w/ Scenario 2 and modify down	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General			
Minimize displacement of existing homes	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
15% affordable and/or work force housing requirement	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
All development w/in 1/4 miles of trolley stop must include residential	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	UTC		1	
Transit-oriented = 1/4 mile of Trolley stop or 1/2 mile as people walk	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	UTC			
All new residential to incorporate proportionate recreational outdoor space	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General		1	1
No rezone of library	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		
No rezone of single family home areas	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
No development in open space, MSCP, or parks	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General			1
Maintain customer parking on commercial sites	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General			
Maintain or increase setbacks on commercial sites	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General - South UC			
Do not rezone outside of focus areas	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	General	1		
Limit to 12-18 du/ac (townhomes) - South UC Plazas	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	
University Square: retail must be maintained, 45' height limit, limit housing to 12-18 du/ac (townhomes), parking	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	
No residential: Regents Road near San Clemente Canyon	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		1

UC Marketplace: retail must be maintained, 30' height limit, limit housing to 12-18 du/ac (townhomes), focus residential along Regents Rd or Governor (west and south sides), parking	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	
12-18 du/ac (townhomes) okay - SUC plazas	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	
No rezone :: Governor Drive - Summers Park	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	1
No rezoning north and south along Genesee Ave	Save UC Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		1
Reasonable range of scenarios	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Start w/ Scenario 2 & modify +	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Limit to max density to 140 du/ac - exclude high rise	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Maximize affordable housing (15% inclusionary requirement - no in lieu option) ++ commercial industrial linkage fees -consider UC surcharge to deed restrict	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Minimize displacement of existing homes and businesses	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Costa Verde Center - lost opportunity? Key supermarket for seniors and neighboring areas, loss of retail and restaurants	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC			1
Adjust overall densities to reflect Mesa Nueva model (143 du/ac)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC - Nobel/Cam		1	
Intentional land use development - affordable housing w/in proximity to transit and daily needs - incentivize: affordable, dense, multi-bedroom, mixed use development	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Ped/bike pathways + transit; meet existing and projected CAP mode share goals	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			1

Build a variety of housing types (not just high rise buildings) - students, working individuals, small families, large families and our elderly	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Don't replace affordable housing with high-rise development	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General - UTC		1	
Consultation w/ all community members including others +	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Increase housing capacity along trolley/bus - consider upzoning 201/202 - La Jolla Colony Drive	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Add business community to solution for housing - housing on commercial properties	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Need for open space, facilities, etc. for existing and new residents +	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			1
Market rate development and ability to pay for affordable housing - use both to address housing needs	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General		1	
Impacts to public facilities - Example: Governor Drive	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General - South UC			
Underutilized commercial and industrial properties	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Impacts to schools to accommodate population	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Coordinate efforts w/ UCSD	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	General			
Match density at Mesa Nueva (143 du/ac)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC-Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Plan for more housing (RMX) along the Executive Dr. paseo	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC	1	1	
Commercial village up to 143 du/ac, 85' height, potential CPIOZ w/ guidelines to step down	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Plan for housing (RMX) along trolley stations	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC	1	1	
Plan for housing at UTC (RMX)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC	1	1	

Maintain current zoning (0-5 du/ac) - Excalibur Way	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	UTC	1	1	
Lower density - sw Gen/Nobel (prevent displacement)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	Nobel/Gene see	1	1	
Improve safety at Governor & Genesee intersection	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		
Current businesses are 2 stories; parking is essential; retain businesses in shopping center (Governor & Regents - only 2 are for businesses)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		
Governor shopping center - at roofline of surrounding homes	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	
Add height restrictions to Vons and Sprouts shopping centers	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		
Focus Area 5 - not w/in TPA - any future housing will compete with parking; difficult to build park and preserve parking	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1	1	1
No residential here, but retail can help (no mixed use)	Other Public Comment	10/14/22	South UC	1		
CPUS Meeting November 15, 2022						
More density around transit stops and bus stops (Scenario B doesn't go far enough) - support for students/renters - need to reduce carbon emissions. Scenario A is closer	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Reduction from Scenario 1 is too much	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General			
Would like to see Scenario A supported by UCPUS	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General			
145 du/ac is reasonable number; look to other areas (Paris/Amsterdam)	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Area for increase in density would be 4 square kilometers - 80,000 people? Scenarios 1 & 2 proposed 190,000 people? Exceeds density of Paris - should be enough	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General		1	

Drill down into more detail - population numbers (household size), types and amount of square footage, center for biotech and housing - retail, commercial, or high tech jobs?	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Provide jobs-housing ratio/fit	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Protections against displacement - what are specific protections?	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	UTC		1	
Both scenarios - displacement concerns of the least expensive housing + small business properties	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	UTC - Nobel/Cam		1	
Space for open space and new parks (no in lieu fees in higher density areas)	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General			1
Consider integration of religious facilities into proposal	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General			
Scenario B changes to consider for Scenario A: Genesee & Nobel - property along Genesee along Decoro up to Nobel (Rose Canyon/MSCP) - bring down density further	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	UTC	1	1	1
Genesee north of Eastgate - keep condos; south of Genesee; 2 apt complexes - apts in between are still too high (Roselle Canyon drop off) - MSCP/canyon impacts	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	Campus Pt-TCtr	1	1	1
Campus Point - ability to continue biotech uses - flex zone; concerned re: housing right near Nissan (MSCP/Canyon) - reduce further	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	Campus Pt-TCtr		1	1
Climate goals - housing/jobs next to transit stops	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	General	1	1	
Require housing in Urban Village areas - especially Executive Drive, UTC Mall, Trolley Stations	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	UTC	1	1	
La Jolla Village Square - guarantee that redevelopment includes residential up to 145 du/ac - key consideration for height limitation +	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	Nobel/Campus	1	1	

Avoid competition between housing and industry - Zone Community Commercial for Nobel Sq - need for retail requirement; keep community-serving needs	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Southwest corner of Genesee & Nobel - displacement concerns of affordable housing	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	UTC	1	1	
Some change planned at shopping centers - have a discussion to address concerns + consider Scenario A (consider park space & amenities)	Subcommittee Comment	11/15/22	South UC	1		
Identify differences between scenarios	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			
Max 145 du/ac limit; Scenario B is more plausible for Vons/Sprouts; provisions for parks - include as a part of scenarios; reduce density w/in 1/4 mi of MSCP/open space	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General	1	1	1
Need for supermarkets; UTC as potential supermarket site; keep Vons and Sprouts supermarkets	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General - UTC - South UC			
Scenario B; importance of supermarkets and walk access; need for affordable housing	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Need affordable housing; keep shopping centers	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Include housing (incentives, but not rely on EMX)	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
1/4 mile of trolley - have residential/higher density component	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Importance of density along transit line; more housing to support employees and meet CAP goals; minimize CPIOZ controls; keep citywide housing/inclusionary	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
La Jolla Village Square/trolley stations - include (don't remove) residential	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General - Nobel/Campus - UTC		1	
Plan to address parks deficit +	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			1

Adjacency to MSCP - can't use for recreation - mechanism to have open space/recreation requirements	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			1
Include discussion on traffic - how will new cars be accommodated	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			
Concern w Displacement - Aventine: Trulux, Flemmings, Melting Pot - potential loss of 3 restaurants	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			
Include version of Scenario 1 in EIR ++ (especially in focus areas)	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General			
Need for housing; concern re: reduction - housing/climate goals	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Needs of students, renters, and low income residents - consider demographics/past survey	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
Consider condo sites for future redevelopment	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	General		1	
805 & La Jolla Village Drive intersection (NW quadrant) - support housing /mixed use zone - support higher density (hotel + apartments); 80 microunits	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	UTC	1	1	
Provide metrics to support redevelopment of Sprouts/Vons	Other Public Comment	11/15/22	South UC	1		

March 21, 2023 - UCPUS Meeting						
Improve alternative transportation and last mile transit in Torrey Pines area	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Torrey Pines			
Add bike/ped connection from John Jay Hopkins across the new pedestrian bridge to Science Park Rd. Safer, alt to Torrey Pines Rd	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Torrey Pines			
Plan upgrades to TP Rd to meet growth. Preserve planted median	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Torrey Pines			
Require native street trees and native landscaping - sensitive area. Torrey Pines in median and along Torrey Pines Rd	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Torrey Pines			

support land use scenario 1 for the Campus Point/Towne Centre Drive	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Campus Pt-TCtr			
Create at grade exit from Campus Pt Dr to Genesee via CP Ct. re: Fire safety, reduce congestion at Genesee/Campus Pte Dr. Critical if housing approved here.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Campus Pt-TCtr			
Support new at grade exit from Campus Pte Dr to Gen - property owner.	Subcommittee comment					
Pursue recreation/public space sharing arrangements with commercial properties	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	TCtr - General			
Pursue recreation/public space joint use arrangements with commercial properties	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	TCtr - General			
More public parks - commercial properties may have private property concerns	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	TCtr - General			
Pursue recreational joint use with private owners	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	TCtr - General			
Limit height/density adj to MSCP lands. Impacts on biodiversity - lights, noise, human activity. Keep commitment to MSCP	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Campus Pt-TCtr			1
Support higher density, mixed use development at Nobel Square. Lift height limit to accommodate.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1		
Support higher density, mixed use at Nobel Sq. Approp location. Lift 30' height limit. No ocean views.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1		
Support increasing height limit for residential and retail (only). Increase pedestrian safety on Nobel Drive at Nobel Sq (reduce cars). Create ped bridge from Ralphs to Whole Foods side.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1	1	

Incorporate Scenario B solution for this Nobel Sq area. Zone Community Village - retail and housing – not mixed use zoning. Re Prevent displacement of needed housing and retail thru competition with high value commercial – ie. Biotech/high tech. Worst outcome would lift height limit and lose community/regional serving retail and housing. Zone or overlay to preserve for housing and retail at Nobel Sq - both plazas.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Support increased density within ¼ mile of transit station, with housing. Commercial development within ¼ mile trolley should consider housing and include parking. New mixed use development should be zoned to require community serving retail.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus		1	
Create ped bridge across Nobel - Ralphs to Whole Foods. Increase pedestrian safety on Nobel.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1		
Support Ped bridge across Nobel. University should subsidize student housing (Nobel Sq) to make this part of campus solution	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Incorporate Scenario B solution for this area. Zone Community Village - retail and housing – not mixed use zoning. Prevent displacement of needed housing and retail by competition with higher value commercial – ie. Biotech/high tech. Worst outcome would be to lift the height limit and see community/regional serving retail and housing pushed out. Zone or overlay to preserve for housing and retail at Nobel Sq - and both sides of Nobel.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus		1	
Plan threatens shopping/grocery stores, which are already insufficient. Protect community serving retail. Preserve parking for mix of customers	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus - General			

Oppose increased densities at Nobel Square. Area is prone to very poor traffic flow. Trolley insufficient to meet transportation needs for a much larger population here.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus			
Nobel Square area needs more park land. More housing requires more park land, and larger park spaces. Plan/Require substantial parks here – with play fields. Not a 10-15 minute walk to any parks.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus			
Need pedestrian safety at Via la Jolla/La Jolla Village Drive. Intersection is really deadly.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus			
Suggest removing parking on Nobel west of Genesee for safety reasons.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus			
Recommend separate, protected bike lanes. Make density contingent on protected bike lanes.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	General			
Not all of the housing can be built in the north. People in the south have to accept some there too. This is one University City.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	UTC-South UC		1	
Support thoughtful rezoning to mixed use to Sprouts and Vons shopping (Governor Drive) and responsible development in north UC: Prioritize equitable affordable development. 20% inclusionary housing. Support tenant protections that guarantee relocation fees and right of return	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	UTC-South UC		1	
Concern re availability of schools to support proposed growth. Elementary schools are over capacity and creating lots of traffic. No space for additional schools. Need coordination with SD Unified.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	UTC-South UC			
Coordinate transparently with SD Unified before adopting scenarios to ensure a plan for schools to serve new residents.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	UTC-South UC			
SUC Plazas are not close to transit – it's a 2 mile or 4 mile round trip	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC			

UC is woefully under park-ed without realistic plan to address. Request city identify land and funds to address parks deficiency and present results ASAP. Plan should mandate new developments build parks onsite and not pay in lieu fees to avoid doing this. Recommend the plan update committee not vote on the plan until this is addressed	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Plan overlay zones to require development of public use parks onsite at time of redevelopment. Mira Mesa has plan overlay zones, including bonuses for providing parks. Include this option for mixed-use zones.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	General			
Preserve existing stock of affordable housing. Some of the most affordable housing in the area at sw corner Nobel and Genesee	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	UTC	1	1	
Costa Verde. Include local services, walkability to reach climate goals. Locate housing close to trolley/transit. Use first 2 stories for affordable, then go up. Reduce the footprint and have more accessible land. Consider an eco-district. Add housing/green space and make Costa Verde a show piece	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	UTC	1	1	
Preserve existing street trees - Sprouts plaza	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1		
Prioritize public safety in traffic study/planning. Proposed lane reduction, Gov Dr, threatens safety in emergency - 3 schools, limited/no transit. All transportation by car.	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1		
Any lane reduction on Gov'n must be studied carefully: analysis during peak/school pick up/drop off/public events/case of emergency	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	South UC			
Preserve community services in redevelopment: urgent care, doctors, and pharmacies.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC			

Control height / set-backs at Vons/Sprouts– avoid towering over houses next door.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC			
Redevelopment in South UC plazas must preserve community serving retail and medical space	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	South UC			
To the subcommittee members: listen to the community. Vote for Scenario B.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Recommend Scenario 1 be included for study in the EIR	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Pursue recreation/public space joint use arrangements with commercial properties	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
More public parks - commercial properties may have private property concerns	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	General			
Pursue recreational joint use with private owners	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	General			
Limit height/density adjacent to MSCP lands. Negative impacts on biodiversity - lights, noise, human activity. Keep commitment to MSCP	Subcommittee comment	3/21/2023	General			1
Written Comment: March 21, 2023 +						
Inclusionary housing at 20%, consider Land Value Recapture, emphasize workforce housing, no in-lieu fee for affordable housing. Strong tenant protections. More Green space - parks and open space.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	1
Support plan update mobility, emphasize frequent transit. School traffic at Governor & Genesee. Support UCSD student voices. Coordinate with SD Unified.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General	1		
Nobel/Campus: Support Mixed-Use, high-density housing, over 30' height limit, housing near jobs/transit. Core: Mixed-use, high-density, jobs, retail. South UC: Mixed-use.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General	1	1	

Increased density problem for traffic, schools. Transit doesn't replace cars. Area has high prices/rents. Future hsg won't be affordable.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	
Parking needed with development. Survey invalid.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Keep lanes on Governor. Grocery shopping needs cars. School traffic.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1	1	
Add housing vertically in existing corridors, don't miss job opportunities, keep smart growth.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	
Support densities in Scenario A & B, remove height limit. No support for affordable housing overlay, park mandates, or more than zone requires.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	Nobel/Campus		1	
Water, infrastructure needed. Off-hours transit needed.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
No towers in Vons/Sprouts, but multi-story mixed use OK. Higher density in Nobel area OK close to transit. No on scenario A.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC, Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Parks: ID park land and funds to address deficiency, present plan to meet park needs before a vote, mandate on-site parks as part of development.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
No addl mobility infrastructure on or over MSCP lands.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			1
Open space density buffer - No greater than 2-3 Story, (10-20 DU/Acre), within ¼ mile of MSCP or open space lands. Minimize ecol impact.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			1
No scenario 1. "B" preferred, maintain commercial zoning as is on Governor Drive, no high density rezoning on Gov'n. More parks; no lane reduction on Governor. Zoning for shopping centers should require keeping existing retail. New housing to require affordable on site.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General - South UC	1	1	
Minimum % workforce/affordable housing required in new development	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	

Limit of 140 DU/Acre in core areas to maintain affordability.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General - UTC			
Limit VMT by preserving community serving retail in all areas with residentia (FA3-5)l. Accomplish with zoning.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Minimum % workforce/affordable housing required. All areas. On site - no in lieu fees.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	
Keep Sprouts zoning less than 30', keep parking, consider surrounding house heights.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1		
No rezoning of single family areas, Sprouts, Vons < 29 DU/Acre, keep retail, with adequate parking. Any new housing must step back from edge/adjacent homes.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1	1	
Support all Save UC recommendations.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General		1	
Consider Scenario B as the voice of the public	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Support new linear parks proposed (Regents N/S, Governor): Involve Parks/Rec boards prior to plan adoption.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General	1		
Traffic congested on Governor/Genesee, bike transport not realistic, no lane reduction.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1		
Don't change Vons/Sprouts/Rite Aid.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	South UC	1		
Maintain essential business in every community: grocery, post office, pharmacies	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
New Rec activities should use public/private opportunities.	Other Public Comment	3/21/2023	General			
Plan parking and infrastructure for new residents - public transit not reliable option for most. Infrastructure should be designed and built before expansion.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
Increased density threatens safety in the case of a fire emergency. Limited road egress.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General - South UC			

1) No commercial properties on Governor Drive should be rezoned for higher density use; 2) No streets with single-family homes should be rezoned3) The number of new housing units should be reduced in both Scenarios A and B.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
1) No commercial properties on Governor Drive should be rezoned for higher density use; 2) No streets with single-family homes should be rezoned. 3) The number of new housing units should be reduced in both Scenarios A and B.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
1) No commercial properties on Governor Drive should be rezoned for higher density use; 2) No streets with single-family homes should be rezoned3) The number of new housing units should be reduced in both Scenarios A and B.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
New density must be supported by new infrastructure; Preserve critical retail/services including small businesses; Don't reduce Governor Dr to one lane in each direction. Two lanes needed during peak hours	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General - South UC	1		
1) No commercial properties on Governor Drive should be rezoned for higher density use; 2) No streets with single-family homes should be rezoned3) The number of new housing units should be reduced in both Scenarios A and B.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
No changes to zoning, density or height limits. No rezone of commercial properties on Governor Drive. No rezone of single-family homes. Reduce new housing in South UC.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
1) No rezone of commercial properties on Governor Dr; 2) No rezone of single-family homes; 3) Reduce proposed housing in both Scenarios A and B. Plazas are distant from transit.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		

UC Marketplace and the University Square, 0 to 29 du/ac is sufficient.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
"Road diet" on Governor Drive is a bad idea because of the schools and park and pools. Don't reduce lanes btn Scripps and Genesee. Consider traffic calming such as a traffic circle at Gov and Mercer.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		
Plazas on Governor are not appropriate for housing as they are far from public transit/trolley.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		
Reconsider high-density housing development in Focus Area 5. Retain Single Family zoning. Prioritize community facilities for all residents.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC		1	
Reduce density - focus area 5. Preserve single family zoned area. Invest in community facilities.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC		1	
Create a second exit in the Campus Point area to accommodate proposed increases in density and development	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	Campus Pt/TCtr	1		
Build pedestrian bridge across Nobel for safety	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	Nobel/Campus	1		
Revise revise 30ft height limit for housing and retail, NOT for BioTech development	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	Nobel/Campus		1	
Require/zone for housing in La Jolla Square.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	Nobel/Campus	1	1	
Add Park Overlay Zones to the maps; incorporate more recreational areas to eliminate the planned park deficit.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC			
Preserve "Community Retail Services" in shopping plazas to reduce VMT	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC			
Governor/Genesee does not meet definition of "Transit Center" (two bus routes). Sprouts Center is more than 1 mile from a "Transit Center." Plan with current conditions vs "projections."	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		
Ensure school capacity is in place before density increases are granted for 30,000 new households.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			

1) Keep existing density at the commercial properties on Governor Drive. 2) No rezoning of single-family residential properties.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1	1	
Plan infrastructure and services to support new population; Plan transparently using data; Increased population density threatens safety and overtakes facilities.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
Plan for parking/continued auto transportation. High density will overwhelm parking - eg Governor Dr	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General	1		
TPA's too large to be realistic.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General - South UC			
Keep Governor two lanes. Provide transit on Gov east of Genesee. Senior hsg needs transit access. Preserve community serving retail.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		
Avoid high density housing in SUC - lack of space	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC		1	
Plan single lane RR overpass/bridge in Rose Canyon for safety reasons	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	South UC	1		
Plan pedestrian tunnels/overpasses to neighboring communities for active transportation and safety. E.g., I-5, I-805, Torrey Pines Road, Genesee Av, Nobel Drive, La Jolla Village Drive, Rose Canyon, train and trolley tracks, SR 52. Partner w stakeholders..	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
Plan People movers / trams / shuttles to connect with neighboring communities. Partner with stakeholders.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
Require public green belts between developments: Eg, green space trail from the UTC to Towne Center Dr - Montrose Parkway	Other Public Comment	3/21-31/2023	General			1

Proposed growth not supported by data. SD is not growing (SANDAG). Proposals driven by industry not housing need. Change in Governor to 1 lane not supportable – peak/school/events. Preserve parking in shopping plazas – crowded now; future shoppers will use/need cars, esp. seniors, families w children. Plan for transportation needs of all ages.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General	1	1	
Address Parks and Infrastructure deficit, esp with reduced share of DIF. Invite fire chief to attend a meeting to address safety concerns with growth.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
Distribute future growth equitably throughout San Diego.	Other Public Comment	3/21-4/11/2023	General			
UCPUS Meeting, February 21, 2023						
No rezoning of single-family streets, no increase in density for Vons, Sprouts commercial and change Scenario A to reflect this.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	South UC			
No rezone of Governor commercial, limit plan density to 140 du/acre, parks part of development, affordable housing with no in-lieu, no development or transit structures in MSCP	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	South UC			1
No rezone Vons, Sprouts	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	South UC			
Traffic studies on Governor imperative, two lanes essential.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	South UC	1		
Lane of parking across from Standley should be a share lane, double park in second lane.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	South UC	1		
Density too high on Governor, use public lands for more development.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	South UC	1		

Safety near schools with increased density.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	South UC			
La Jolla Village Dr. needs protected bike lanes; Genesee needs flex/transit lanes.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	North UC	1		
Support density near transit, invest in greater Super Loop and Trolley frequency.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	North UC			
Enhance pedestrian safety near UTC, UCSD, and La Jolla Village with pedestrian bridges. "Ecodistricts" to improve pedestrian and bike safety near Costa Verde.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	North UC	1		
Use Scenario 1, maximize density near jobs and transit.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Maximize transit/trolley investments, maximize density near transit.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Communicate with school district on density plans.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Traffic safety improvements (drop-off lanes, protected lanes) near schools in plan.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Lane of parking across from Standley should be a share lane, double park in second lane	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Building design standards: use/modify building setbacks for bike lanes.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	General			
Bike safety is done poorly, need better implementation with new plan if want desired bike ridership.	Other Public Comment	2/21/2013	General			
Install protected bike lanes on Genesee, plan for increased traffic and transit at same time.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	General			

Traffic design: Put leading pedestrian intervals, bike boxes, curb extensions to shorten crossing, center island refuges specifically in the plan. Additional bus routes should be in plan. Study conflicts between peds, bikes, and cars.	Subcommittee Comment	2/21/2023	General			
CPUS Meeting - April 18, 2023 -						
Some people didn't attend tonight's mtg bc they didn't feel welcome.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
569 units at Sprouts too high (for comparison 300 at Pallisade) - will increase traffic	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Planning should reflect transparent data, showing housing need and impacts of new housing on prices.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Goal of committee should be a plan the community supports.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Future growth in SD should spread among the 52 communities - not 40% in UC.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Ensure planning takes account of all age groups, including seniors. Over emphasis on bike/ped infrastructure to exclusion of seniors who will need automobiles. "Bikes and the trolley won't get us to the doctor's office."	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Where will the money come from to pay for infrastructure, bike lanes, and other proposals. Waiting nine years for three streetlights.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Plan ignores electric vehicles, conflates autos with Ghgs. Emphasis on public transit and bicycle transportation discriminates by age and disability.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Re Figure 3, p 31 - Re mixed use land use of 143du/ac for church property, Genesee and Eastgate. A covenant on the property restricts use for housing.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	

p 88, figure. land use for places of worship should be institutional	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Fig 15, p. 98 - image of complete street lacks handicapped parking. Plan overall ignores handicapped parking.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
p 99 - priority for "active transportation" involves age and disability discrimination.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Agree: EV's are a missing feature that should be addressed in the CPU.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				
Discussion Draft has not incorporated changes. SUC Plazas should remain 29 du/ac. No reduction of lanes on Governor Dr. Switch to bus transit impractical due to budget shortfalls at MTS. Multi-mobility hubs unlikely for lack of funding. Require redevelopment of commercial plazas that include housing to retain community retail/ services; strike language "if feasible." Require onsite parking for residents and visitors. Cap maximum densities at 140 du/ac (no room for parks, no funding for police services and unaccounted ADU/Housing 2.0 increases). Require a percentage of affordable housing on site - no in lieu fees.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1	1	
Community lacks schools to serve proposed growth.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Subcommittee consensus that City coordinate closely with school district. Strengthen language on p 160 to include transparency and specificity.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				
We need to plan for housing that is affordable and has 2-3-bedroom apartments not just studios/1bedrooms	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23			1	
As civil engineer, reduction of lanes on Governor Drive appears unsupportable. No data provided otherwise. Keep two lanes in each direction.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		

No rezone at SUC plazas. Community lacks roads, parking, emergency exits to serve proposed growth.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Support highest density scenario to provide housing for next generation. Adding high density near transit is essential for the future.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Corrections in Discussion Draft: Land Use map, p. 31 Scripps and UCSD Hospitals missing - also, Torrey Pines City Park, Eastgate Mini Park 2; Correct institutional land use at 805/Governor off ramp - part is park and ride. SUC golf course zoned as open space; 15 acres behind Univ Gardens Park is shown as Institutional - should be Utility or Open Space; Open space on Regents Road was considered for development by owners.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		1
Policy p170 1.1D , In lieu fees: change “encourage” to “require” affordable housing	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23			1	
Policy p170.1.1F , revise idea of stacked flats with no stairs for seniors, how is fire egress going to happen with multistory with no stairs?	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23			1	
Policy, p174 2.9A/D policies contradict – short side or wide side going towards the canyon?	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				1
Policy, p174.2.1 parking – require flat plate design so if cars do go away, you can repurpose parking to another use.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				
Add houses of worship to list that should be marked as institutional	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				
Policy p175. 2.19.a : Govn plazas/retail. remove “where feasible”.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		
Subcommittee consensus through discussion: Default land use for houses of worship should be institutional unless requested by the congregation.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23				

<p>Subcommittee consensus through discussion: SUC Plazas: Community serving retail and services must be retained - through zoning and stronger policies/ SDRs. Require adequate parking. Avoid impacts to adjacent properties: include set backs and step backs to ensure separation; limit height (lower than 100') . Mass development on larger streets - Governor and Genesee/Regents - away from neighbors. Plan for improved internal circulation - pathways btn new housing and retail and neighboring uses - e.g. library/schools.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1	1	
<p>North UC needs similar consideration. Plans for 50k people require not just <i>protection</i> of retail but insistence that development <i>ADD</i> community retail and services.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23			1	
<p>Consideration of density in SUC plazas. Chair comment - a max of 500 dwelling units (73 du/ac) at Vons plaza may be appropriate given adequate setbacks, stepbacks, height limits, etc, discussed above. Hsg on top of retail. Lower density is appropriate for Sprouts plaza - (adj to one story homes, lack of transit - fails climate action goals). South UC is best hope for diverse and affordable private housing - land less expensive than NUC.</p>	Subcommittee Comment	4/18/23		1	1	
<p>73 du/ac too much, will require higher than 4-7 stories. Likelihood of tower development overshadowing low rise neighbors. Height limit of 100' too high.</p>	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
<p>We have to give some thought to who will live here after us. Comments on Sprouts are appropriate, less suited for towers, but higher density at Vons.</p>	Subcommittee Comment	4/18/23		1	1	
<p>Without resolution of Governor Dr issue, I can't address whether this proposal is doable.</p>	Subcommittee Comment	4/18/23		1		

Support lower height limit for SUC plazas.	Subcommittee Comment	4/18/23		1		
Lack perspective to comment on Sprouts but we should be pushing for as much mixed use as possible I agree with Vons because it is connected on bus lines. We need to push for better bus service too.	Subcommittee Comment	4/18/23		1	1	
No subcommittee consensus on density at SUC plazas.	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		
We heard more consensus on different densities for the two plazas - lower at Sprouts	Other public comment	4/18/23		1	1	
Discussion of hsg goals for UC is incomplete wo data and projections for SB9 and Housing 2.0. Plan ignoresongoing development.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Plan ignores new park needs - specific lands should be identified for purchase. No new parks are proposed. Future population will require cmty parks with play fields - not just paseos and miniparks - or quality of life for future population will be miserable.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
As bike commuter, agree that Governor issue needs solving. Have watched bike lanes removed from Governor w of Genesee. City does not follow through on its plans for bike infrastructure. Genesee in NUC is a further example. New bike facilities violate NACTO safety standards for intersections. We need planning and implementation to meet Vision Zero. The city is not listening in UC.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		

<p>Subcommittee consensus through discussion: Nobel/Campus - Commercial plazas north and south of Nobel Dr (La Jolla Village Square/Whole Foods): Plan for development above coastal height limit, but retain new height limit (discussion range of 85'-100') with the following expectations: Zone for housing and community-serving retail - rather than mixed use. Retain and expand community serving retail and services - use zoning, policy and SDRs. Prioritize new housing through same. Avoid competition with higher value uses (tech/biotech). Preserve parking for residents and shoppers. Setback-step back from edges to protect adjacent hsg. Concentrate density toward Trolley station/Nobel Dr./I-5 - away from adj neighbors. Plan to include community scale park here to meet needs of area residents. Concentrate density near Trolley to facilitate. Consider pedestrian bridge across Nobel Dr; consider removing parking on Villa La Jolla-Nobel.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1	1	
<p>Subcommittee consensus through discussion: Area to north of two shopping plazas includes and is appropriate to mixed use - hotels, offices, medical offices, etc.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		
<p>Redevelopment of these plazas should include new park. Area is deficient in park space.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		
<p>Consider adding pedestrian bridge across Nobel to connect the two commercial plazas. Consider removing parking on Villa La Jolla and Nobel to accommodate new traffic and for safety.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1		
<p>Area appropriate for higher height and density w sensitive planning. Concentrate height/density near trolley to minimize impact on adjacent housing and accommodate more park space.</p>	Subcommittee comment	4/18/23		1	1	

Written Comments - CPUS meeting, April 18, 2023						
No addl hsg at SUC plazas: limited transit-parking, no guarantee of commercial staying put or park space on site.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1	1	
Provide traffic data supporting change to 2 lanes on Governor Dr, including projected bike use.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Where will water come from to support projected growth? How is affordable housing defined?	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Integrate SUC plazas w surrounding neighbors - including mobility connections - do not fence in new residents from neighborhoods.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Plan includes too much new concrete. Concern with meeting climate action plan. Roads in NUC unmanageable with current densities.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Base planning on data. Proposed road changes should reflect transparent traffic impact analysis. Utility feasibility study to "right size" future population.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Keep Governor 4 lanes - no traffic studies have been shared with public to support. Plan for egress in emergency. What is actual plan for additional schools? Assure capacity for neighborhood children. Where is vehicle storage for new residents?	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Plan less density for NW cor Regents/Governor - plaza too small, constrained, poor access - all right-in/right-out.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		

Preserve groceries and drug stores in SUC plazas. Food and medicine are essential services.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Community serving retail - revise policies: SDR 19b is too small. 15,000 sf to small for food and bev - Sprouts is 28,000 sf. Revise SDRs for protection of retail to assure	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Community serving retail - revise policies: Policy 2.19a Retain Grocery stores (cut "where feasible").	Other public comment	4/18/23				
SUC plazas, support subcommittee comment - Sprouts plaza appropriate for less density than Vons.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Plan is age-ist. Plan UC for residents to be able to age in place. Focus on bike mobility disadvantages elderly who cannot ride bikes to dr appts and shopping. Residents cannot afford to move to luxury senior living facilities. Acknowledge residents' long connections to building UCSD and local industry.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Mobility/Sustainability Policies: Mandate EV charging stations for devl over certain size.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Agree w subcommittee comment on lower density appropriate for Sprouts (29du/ac) and Vons plazas. Preserve mixed retail, housing, parking. Require 60-70% of new units there to be affordable housing.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	1

Bike mobility - follow traffic analysis, mandate compliance with MUTCD design to assure flow/logic/convenience. If bike lane replaces parking, plan for parking challenges, also bus lanes and flow. Vons plaza has more transit access than Reg/Gov.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
NW cor Regents and Governor - reduce planned density. Small parcel, limited set backs. Increased density will shade out adjacent homes; poor transit.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
School district should commit to new schools to support population growth. Need "real and meaningful" affordability.	Other public comment	4/18/23				1
Keep SUC plazas 29 du/ac; Require plazas to retain community serving commercial - cut "where feasible" (Policy 2.19a). New housing must provide on-site parking (not just unbundled - revise policy 2.19D). Plazas must have parking for residents and services; UC plan should count projected housing growth at UCSD, ADUs, Housing 2.0/SB10.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	1
Keep Governor 4 lanes;	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Limit du/ac to 140/ac throughout the plan - park deficit, emergency service deficits.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Require on-site affordable housing. "Require" not "consider" on site affordable (Policy 1.1D). In-lieu fees and credits do not work.	Other public comment	4/18/23				1
SUC plazas: require height limits: 30ft at Sprouts; 50ft at Vons. Set-back from surrounding hsg.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	

Balance mobility planning - bikes and busses not feasible for many or in all conditions, stages of life. Mass transit is poor quality. Keep Governor 4 lanes - Road diet will increase pollution w cars stuck in traffic. Retain parking at shopping cts to keep stores in business.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Governor Dr: No rezoning; no bike lanes; no lane reduction. Limit overall increase in to 10,000 du's.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1	1	
Include EV charging stations in plan.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Plan for seniors (and all ages). Significant population can't ride bikes. Require parking w redevelopment of SUC plazas.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		
Plan for expansion of retail (not just retention). Increased pop/jobs require increased retail.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Plan for access to grocery, etc, during redevelopment.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Analyze scenario 1 in EIR.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Undertake analysis of Land Value Capture to finance affordable hsg, mobility infrastructure.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Final draft of CPU should include current and projected mode shift.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Include scenario 1 as preferred alternative in EIR. Make most of mid-coast trolley - housing and climate crisis.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Include flex lane for buses on Genesee.	Other public comment	4/18/23		1		

Include scenario 1 in EIR. Maximize density in transit rich area. Include flex lane on Genesee btn Nobel and 52 - keep buses on time to achieve mode shift.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Require parking with new housing. Expand retail - include parking. Keep existing zoning for SUC plazas. More density at Govn and Genesee is dangerous for MS and Elem students crossing. Schools cannot accommodate more housing at Vons plaza. No available land. Keep Govn 4 lanes. Spread building across the city - not concentrated in a few cmtys.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
No increase in density at SUC plazas - given new devl through ADUs, SB9-10, UCSD. Include reasonable height limit.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	1
City wide DIF policy reduces likelihood needed infrastructure will be built - transportation, parks, open space, library, sewers).	Other public comment	4/18/23				1
Revise plan for all ages : currently missing are families with children, seniors, disabled.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Fully estimate new hsg in UC: include projections for ADUs, SB9-10, UCSD in addition to plan changes.	Other public comment	4/18/23				1
SUC plazas: Keep 29 du/ac. Building this housing will increase hsg while minimizing cmtty impacts. Add height limit 30-40ft. Reduce 100' limit.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	1
Canyon adjacent development. No high density (>20 du/ac) wi 1/4 mile of canyons and open space. Reduce proposed density at SW cor Nobel/Genesee - 218du/ac too high.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	1

Limit du/ac to 140/ac throughout the plan - high rise more costly to build, no help to affordability.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Scale setbacks and step-backs away from existing low rise housing. Taller bldgs further from existing...	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Purchase land for new parks in No and So UC. Draft includes nice park improvements but they are not aggressive enough.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Parks need to be mandatory (w new development)	Other public comment	4/18/23				
SUC plazas: Keep 29 du/ac. Retain commercial retail. Add height limit 30-40ft. 100' limit too high.	Other public comment	4/18/23			1	
Poll audience for opinions.	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Pedestrian bridges are a bad idea: expensive, not ADA compliant w/ elevators, money better spent on other facilities. Consider transit design for safe ped crossings - safe harbors in medians, etc. Need more research	Other public comment	4/18/23				
Written Comment 4/18 - 5/10/23						

Reduce overall proposed density - Increased density (more than 2x the population) is unreasonable. Plan housing throughout the city. Plan is deficient in park space; proposed increases will overwhelm existing parks and negatively impact canyons and open spaces. Plan relies unreasonably on future transit development by MTS/SANDAG which are not guaranteed. Development without infrastructure.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				1
UC Marketplace: Regents/Gov'n - Reduce to 29du/ac; 40' height limit - reduce from 100'; Edit SDR 7 p198 - include rear and side set backs of 30'. Edit Policy, #1.2A on p. 170 to read "Redevelopment of existing neighborhood services must include replacement with a similar or same use." Edit Policy #2.19A to read: "Grocery stores on large sites must be retained." Adjust parking requirements.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23		1	1	
Improve clarity/accessibility of plan for all users: e.g., distinguish land use colors in Figure 3. Identify du/ac for photographs of different land use types. Clearly identify proposed height limits, setbacks and parking requirements. Identify full impact at build including "density bonus", Complete Communities, SDAs, ADUs. Allow readers to predict what community could actually be like.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				

<p>University Square - Cor. Genesee and Governor - Reduce to 54du/ac; 50' height limit (reduce from 100'); Edit SDR7 p 198: add rear and side setbacks of 30' - ; preserve community retail and services: Edit Policy 1.2A p 170 to read: "Redevelopment of existing neighborhood services must include replacement with a similar or same use." Edit poicy 2.19A to read: "Retain grocery stores on large sites where feasible" to "Grocery stores on large sites must be retained."</p>	<p>Other public comment - Help Save UC</p>	<p>5/4/23</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>SUC plazas, Parking requirements : Provide onsite parking for future residents and shoppers; one space per d/u required; maintain current parking (415 and 125) as minimum. Change Policy 2.19D to read: "New residents should be encouraged to use alternative transportation modes, but to limit impacts on surrounding neighborhoods, at least one parking space per dwelling unit must be required."</p>	<p>Other public comment - Help Save UC</p>	<p>5/4/23</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Cor, Genesee and Governor - (excl University Square) 4 corners plus Chase/Carl's Jr : Reduce maximum density to 29du/ac; retain current height limits; Add read and side setbacks of 30'; Edit policy 2.19D to read: "New residents should be encouraged to use alternative transportation modes, but to limit impacts on surrounding neighborhoods, at least one parking space per dwelling unit must be required."</p>	<p>Other public comment - Help Save UC</p>	<p>5/4/23</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	

Edit Policy #1.1B. change from “Concentrate the development of higher density housing in University near public transit, job centers, and within Sustainable Development Areas” to “Concentrate the development of higher density housing in University to the areas within one-half mile walking distance of existing major transit stops.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Delete policy #1.1C. Regulations allowing for ADUs currently exist. Statement is unnecessary.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Edit Policies Section 1.1 and Section 1.2 : Add a letter G: “For existing shopping centers in all plan focus areas that provide community-serving retail such as grocery stores, pharmacies, post offices, restaurants and similar services, parcels will be zoned to require that community-serving retail remains, with housing added as a secondary use.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Edit Policy #1.7K ti read (new language shown by underline): <u>“Encourage the development of housing that is affordable to and meets the diverse needs of the employees in University to attract employees, support reduced commute times, increase active transportation, and minimize transportation costs, but ensure it is also protective of surrounding neighborhoods and incorporates on-site parking to minimize impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.”</u>	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	

Edit Policy #2.4C : (new language shown by underline): <u>“Attenuate noise through the use of berms, planting, setbacks and architectural design rather than with conventional wall barriers for developments next to transit, trolley, highways or other potential noise-generating uses. <u>Attenuate noise from new residential or commercial projects sited next to existing residential homes with setbacks, non-conventional uses as described in the prior sentence, and with conventional wall barriers if necessary.”</u></u>	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Edit Policy #2.4D to read: “Require open spaces, such as greenways and courtyards, to serve dual functions as valuable community space and buffers between different uses.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				1
Add new Policy #2.9E: “Development adjacent to open spaces, MSCP, parks or canyons should have limited development, as native ecosystems are sensitive to light and noise pollution and increased human traffic.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				1
Add a Policy #2.11E : “New projects should ensure that lighting does not impact adjacent residential uses.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	

Edit #2.19B : Policy should be changed from, “Encourage moderate density mixed-use development opportunities and expand the mix of uses, while maintaining small business character and resident amenities,” to “Consider moderate density mixed-use development opportunities to expand the mix of uses, while ensuring protection of existing small businesses and resident amenities.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Add a Policy 3.9G: “Ensure that new projects sited next to existing residential uses provide sufficient parking to ensure no impacts to adjacent residential communities from new residents or commercial visitors.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Add a Policy 4.1V : “All new residential projects must incorporate recreational outdoor space proportional to the size of the project as part of base zoning (not as part of a density bonus).”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Edit Table 4: Planned Roadway Classifications Modifications (p. 113) . Keep Governor Drive as 4-Ln Major Arterial. Delete change to 2-Ln Major Arterial. A second lane is needed to support drop off and pick up activities from Spreckels Elementary, Standley Middle School and Curie Elementary. Furthermore, two lanes will not support the additional traffic likely to occur from doubling the population of the University City Community as proposed by this Plan.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	

<p>Edit SDR 19: pg. 200 : (changes underlined below) that sites designated as community commercial, <u>community village, and neighborhood commercial</u> that are 50,000 square feet or more shall maintain a minimum of <u>25 percent</u> (instead of 10 percent) of the gross floor area for commercial services and retail sales uses. Sites designated as community commercial, <u>community village, and neighborhood commercial</u> with greater than 100,000 square feet shall maintain a minimum of <u>30,000 square feet</u> (instead of 15,000) of gross floor area for food, beverages and groceries use.</p>	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				
<p>Edit SDR-20 Inclusionary Housing Requirement 1) to require that at <u>least 20% of the total dwelling units</u> in a proposed residential or mixed-use development shall be set aside as affordable to be occupied by very-low-, low-, and moderate-income households. 2) Revise to state that off-site construction of affordable units or payment of in-lieu fees are not allowed as an alternative method of compliance; on-site construction of units must be required. Building affordable units off site is contrary to goal of maximizing impact of trolley.</p>	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
<p>Edit Table 6 #1.1D, 2.19C, and 1.7J-K : require affordable housing; don't just to encourage it.</p>	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	

Edit SDR-21(c) : to require that properties adjacent to open space adopt building transition standards as in SDR-7, - i.e., a 45° angle above 30'. Reduce visual and environmental impacts on open spaces. Update Table 6 #2.9A to be reflected this change.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23				1
Edit SDR-24 : to read “Freeway-adjacent parcels may only provide a 15-foot upper story setback starting at a height of 50 feet above ground level for the residential building.”	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Adopt noise abatement requirement: new projects adjacent to residential uses to minimize noise impacts by orienting businesses in the structures away from the existing residences.	Other public comment - Help Save UC	5/4/23			1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. New for profit housing will not increase affordability. City TPAs/SDAs over 1/2 mile are too large to work.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Do not oppose development in general but scale proposed here.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Public outreach has been insufficient.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Proposed plan allows too much density and population with no guarantees for our neighborhood services, public safety, parks, schools, or libraries.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	

Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Oppose new city housing plans and policies. Preserve urban tree canopy.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. High density proposals will not produce affordable housing. Will harm existing community.	Other public comment	5/8/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/9/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Oppose new city housing plans and policies. Preserve urban tree canopy.	Other public comment	5/10/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/10/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points.	Other public comment	5/10/23		1	1	
Oppose planned changes to neighborhoods and shopping plazas. Infrastructure and parking cannot support. Public transit underused and inadequate to support future growth.	Other public comment	5/10/23				

Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. Almost 100% of SUC residents oppose draft plans. Resident concerns must be answered. Discussion draft based on flawed assumptions and survey. Ensure adequate fire safety in cmty plan. Specify affordable housing percentage. Lobbying contacts w process should be made public. Plan for all ages. Emphasis on active mobility discriminates against seniors.	Other public comment	5/10/23		1	1	
Letter supporting HSUC's stated points. ALSO, plan should promote affordable housing through Public Private Partnerships. For profit market will not build sufficient affordable housing. CPU must consider environmental impact of new construction and longterm social wellbeing impacts (sufficient open/green space, parks & non-commercial community gathering space, public transportation).	Other public comment	5/10/23		1	1	1
Proposed densities at SUC plazas not supported by infrastructure; Sprouts Center outside TPA/SDA; Please provide traffic data to support Governor Dr lane reduction - or cut the proposal. Provide data for housing need in CPU; plan based on what infrastructure can support. Doubling the population without new roads, schools, parks, libraries, fire stations and potential improvements to utility systems is poor planning, Please plan for fire danger. Final plan should show emergency egress in this high risk zone. Include input from Fire Chief or Batallion Chief, Police Northern Division, SDUSD, Parks and Recreation, and Transportation.	Other public comment	5/5/23	SUC	1	1	

<i>Tags</i>							
Mobility	Land Use	Implemen tation	Parks	Retail	Public Safety	Urban Greening	Policy specific
	1						
	1						
		1					
	1	1					
	1	1					
	1						