



## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, May 18, 2020

Regular Time 5:30 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

### 5:35 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

AW: Calls the meeting to order and calls the roll.

#### **Roll Call:**

##### *Members present:*

Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Debby Knight (DK), George Lattimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Kris Kopensky (KK), Abbey Reuter (AR), Melanie Cohn (MC), Carol Uribe (CU)

##### *Members not present:*

Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Laurie Phillips (LP)

##### *Non-voting Member:*

Kristin Camper (KC).

*Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy.*

##### *City Staff:*

Tait Galloway (TG)

Katie Witherspoon (KW) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department

Diego Velasco (DV) – Consultant, Urban Design and Planning

Rick Barrett (RB) – Consultant, M/G

Steven Davidovas (SD) – Consultant

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein	(BB)
Nancy Groves	(NG)
Deanna Ratnikova	(DR)
Diane Ahern	(DA)
Kaitlyn Willoughby	(KWI)
Louis Rodolico	(LR)
David Campbell	(DC)
Nico Calavita	(NC)
Alyssa Helper	(AH)

Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Andrew Barton	(AB)
Public member	(Public)

## 5:39 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

DA: Hello friends and neighbors, it's Diane Ahern, president of the University City Fire Safe Council, with a public safety alert.

Did you know that May is Wildfire Awareness Month?

We can use the Fire Department's Ready, Set, Go! to help prevent and prepare for wildfire.

- Be Ready: Create and maintain defensible space and protect your home against flying embers.
- Get Set: Prepare your family and your home ahead of time for the possibility of having to evacuate.
- Be Ready to GO!: Maintain situational awareness at all times. If our area is in danger, go early for your safety. If you are caught in a wildfire, follow the evacuation orders of local law enforcement.

The Fire Safe Council is made up of a group of neighbors and friends, all volunteers, who are developing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan – a CWPP - for our area.

We've been working on this for months and we're almost ready to send it to the city, county, and state fire departments for their review and approval. This is your last chance to take a look and comment on the draft CWPP.

Evacuation Planning is one of the focus areas in the CWPP. Those of us who live in the area know that many of our residential streets are dead ends. Sometimes there may be only one way out. Depending on the location of the fire, this may present a challenge to evacuation planning. Now, today, during Wildfire Awareness Month, is a perfect time to create your personal Wildfire Protection Plan using the fire department's Ready, Set, Go! as your personal template for fire prevention and preparation.

I will put a link to the draft CWPP and other resources in the chat. And I invite you to contact me directly. I'll put my contact info in the chat also.

Thank you for helping to keep our community Fire Safe.

Jeff Dosick: A comment on the Rose Canyon [Rose Creek] Bike Path, opening up from University City to Pacific Beach. Access to the bike path from UC is important, so Cargill, Decoro, and Arriba need to have painted "sharrows". If you can't safely get to the bike path it won't be used.

Den Danner: I am a resident for greater than 30 years and was a member of the San Diego bike club. There are no markings for bicycles on the street from Governor down to Stressman.

AR: I want to encourage discussion of lifting the 30' height limit. This should lead to more affordable housing in the area.

Aiden Lin: (UCSD Student). Same comment as Abbey Reuter.

Abigail Glatt: (UCSD Student). Also supports raising the 30' height limit.

Salomon Gallo: (UCSD Student). Also supports raising the 30' height limit.

JS: On the 30' height limit, the reality is that density will be worse, not more affordable. It's a mistake to look at it like this.

John Lee Evans: "Imagine UC 2020" is being completed this fall. Please look at traffic calming measures along Governor Drive outside of Standley from Stadium St. To Radcliffe St using paint. Still allows for future expansion but helps in the meantime.

NG: The 30' height limit is more about the La Jolla Innovation Center, rather than housing which we are all in favor of.

Cedric Garland: Environmentalists worked very hard to get a 30' limit in place. You can see the sky, but it also limits density. The City proposes more density than there should be.

MC: Thanks to the UCSD students on the call.

#### **5:57 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – March 17, 2021**

No changes are proposed. AW moves adoption, DiM seconds. Approved without objection.

Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes for this meeting.

#### **6:00 Information Item #1: Urban Design Elements #2 – Diego Velasco**

AW: The subcommittee worked hard to get this presentation before the committee.

KW: Appreciates the topic. We'll review housing within the City and then we'll score the art contest.

Schedule:

June:	Urban Design #3
July	Urban Design #4. Parks and Open Space
August	Urban Design and Land Use
Sept	OCET preview
Oct	No meeting. OCET this October, public workshop
Nov	No meeting.
Dec:	OCET, PC Workshop
Jan 2022	PC workshop.
Feb	UCPG
March	Back to subcommittee

I see some hands...

KR: Will there be meetings in December?

CN and KW: Will sort this out later but will be mindful of the holidays.

KW: State determines RHNA targets for the region. The 2021-2029 housing element was adopted in 2019-2020. Income levels: VL: 0:50 L 51-18 M 81-119 AM 120+ with AMI of 96K. Need 108K units. affordable too low.

[slide numbers in brackets.]

[#15] Housing stats.

[#16] Housing related action from 2014-2018.

[#17] New Zones, like RMX/EMX. TPA parking standards.

[#18] LDC Update package.

[#19] Reference programs, housing, and toolkits.

[#20] Plan updates via CPUs and specific plans.

[#21] Mission Valley Plan Update, Kearney Mesa Plan Update, Balboa and Morena Specific Plans.

[#22] University Community housing.

JS: What is “deed restricted”?

[#23] University RHNA sites: 749 in UC. These sites cannot be rezoned to non-residential as part of the plan update by state law and the CAP. Under the current Community Plan, housing is maxed out.

[#24, #25] Examples of the Kearney Mesa Plan Update and the Mission Valley Plan Update policies.

[#26] Housing policies from the Clairmont Plan Update Draft Plan.

Back to Andy.

AW: We have some interesting, decades-involved, people in the audience.

JS: Would like to know what we can do as a PG- to encourage housing.

AW: I’ll share some of my thoughts.

- It’s critical to solve the housing problem for survival of the City as it is. We increase commercial density that draws workers to better jobs. The jobs / housing balance is threatened.
- Thinks that the private market won’t do the job. KW’s numbers give us a good idea of what to expect. 85% of housing goes to the highest income level. Affordable gets the other 15%. Moderate gets essentially zero., so it must be incentivized. We need to demand that the city begin here.

Tools:

- Public benefit planning that links zoning and planning with parks and housing to capture land value.
- Can do a CPOZ on a smaller scale, for Transit Oriented Development (TOD), for example with linkages to parks and mobility.
- Specific policies that include FAR housing bonus by providing a bonus on a smaller commercial footprint.

- We can require building of inclusionary housing in UC. We should ask for higher inclusionary housing (from a 2% to 4% range to a higher range, more like 15% to 20%).
- Include nexus specific projects.

Nico Calavita (NC): Lived in UC before moving to Berkeley. Affordable housing is difficult but astonished to see 1.4% in UC versus 4.5% city-wide. It's not easy to build affordable housing, but we can do it with recapture. Expansion of the trolley increases values tremendously.

We can also do it via increased density. If you lower the FAR, you will get more expensive housing. You ask for additional amenities and benefits from developers. Take an increase of the land value, capture it for public benefit. How much is a question: produce a higher affordable housing percentage or do it by fees. 40% of the households in the city are low income. This is key. Affordable production is nowhere near enough. Overseas money creates 'non-financial speculation'. There should also be a commercial linkage fee to build affordable housing. The nexus: You could put all the money into a pot only to use it in UC.

KR: Do ADUs fit into this? I'd like to see more of that. South UC has so few housing opportunities. We need to stop developers from paying in-lieu fees.

DK: I have tried to get a handle on this. The situation is impossible, but I don't see a solution. The City wants to take parcels and build twice as much with all the benefit to Wall Street. The City has allowed a 10% affordable – 90% luxury mix. The residents of luxury housing don't take the trolley. You will get no moderate-income housing. There were 37 units total of moderate-income housing citywide. Katie, do students qualify for affordable housing? That will vastly increase their presence in the affordable housing pool.

KW: For students it depends on their ties to parents and full or part time job status.

DK: Any student who is a graduate or independent would be qualified.

KW: I don't know about how many students occupy affordable housing.

AW: Question for NC: Could you elaborate on examples in LA, SF, or Berkeley?

NC: A commercial linkage would be a first. It seems quite possible to link increased density to fees.

Responding to criticism from the students earlier: Housing is complicated, but to propose increasing heights are a means of increasing housing where heights go up, building material costs go way up. Land values then go up. So, it's not simple. [That's why recapture has utility.] The height limit was passed to get predictability and having a height limit does do this.

KW: I recognize there is a diversity of opinion here. I would like to say we should stay away from keeping the students from having their paean.

JS: This is helpful, but Katie, is the Housing Element up to date? Lots of analysis went into this. Were all students included? If not, the problem is worth additional consideration.

KW: According to SANDAG, students are only included if they reside on campus.

JS: This means our needs are much larger. 2020 stood a lot of the analysis on its head.

RRW: The Mission Valley, Navajo, and La Jolla Community Plans discuss the need to utilize underused property. What is the R-1-14 zone? Also, there are other means to possibly help reduce down payment requirements and monthly payments?

NC: [FROZE].

Mack Langston: Agrees with NC, maybe not completely, but focusing on the complicated issues like the much higher expense of higher buildings.

Ron Floyd: Question for all concerning Land Use Planning. Why do we persist in allowing companies to set up shop without regard to where their employees live? Why not provide space to live like universities do? If we'd started like this in the beginning when businesses were built, we'd already be reaching our goals.

Cedric Garland: A bit of despair about attracting more tall buildings to an area with high energy use that exceeds the environmental capacity of the area.

Susan Baldwin: Supports NC's ideals. Would support the City's search for more affordable housing. A Public Benefit program would not be done in a vacuum but would be set at an economic level and scientific level. This only makes sense if jobs also are nearer to housing. With the exception of Kearny Mesa, added after 2008, we have identified more than 100,000 units.

RC: Listening to all the changes over the last few years, I have heard scientists say we have to change our life and maybe the UCPG can define what kind of life the community can make for itself. Looking out at the pig picture, if we come up with something presentable to the rest of the City, we should share it.

Susan Baldwin: I was a planner for UC in the 80's and worked on the RHNA project at SANDAG.

Abigail Glatt: Thanks to all for letting us participate. California will grow no matter what, so what it comes down to is reducing the amount people drive.

NC: Employers need a nudge, and they have some responsibility. Especially Hospitals, with a large number of low-income workers. Maybe land on their properties can be used to develop housing.

Susan Baldwin: Someone pointed out in the chat that if including housing is required, you won't get housing. I disagree.

MC: The evidence is that it doesn't get built.

Ron Floyd: I support NC's statement on hospitals. All would fit into the low/moderate range for housing. Sharp has bought units for expansion. We should look at this.

MC: I put my thoughts in the chat. I think there is a problem with people having a background conversation that are one-sided. The City has decided to move forward with a pot; the linkage fee is not realistic as this is a huge undertaking and separate from the Plan Update. This is disappointing.

JS: I think the variety is astonishing. I would be really interested in hearing from a non-profit

developer building these houses to hear the various sides so we have a better perspective about what the plan can and cannot do.

DK: Agrees with JS. How do we get diversity when we get 37 housing units in the mid-income range? Lots of people that do jobs in the community need this housing. This is necessary for reality.

AW: Appreciates Tait Galloway and Katie Witherspoon for putting this on the agenda this time. We will continue to support the staff in their work on the plan. This was an outstanding conversation.