



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, December 8, 2020

Regular Time 5:30 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

5:33 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), Laurie Phillips (LP), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Petr Krysl (PK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Melanie Cohn (MC), Kristin Camper (KC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Carol Uribe (CU), Abbey Reuter (UCSD Student Rep to CPUS), Andrew Zhou (UCSD Student Rep to UCPG).

Members not present:

None

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

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

City Staff:

Tait Galloway (TG) – Program Manager, Planning Department

Katie Witherspoon (KW) – University CPU Project Manager, Planning Department

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein	(BB)
Nancy Groves	(NG)
Deanna Ratnikova	(DR)
Diane Ahern	(DA)
Justine Murray	(JuM)
Louis Rodolico	(LR)
David Campbell	(DC)
Alyssa Helper	(AH)
Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Public member	(Public)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

No minutes were offered for approval at this meeting.

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

5:39 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

LR: Comment on Westfield/Regents Road Bridge and the effect of Citizens United on politics.

RRW: Comment on zoning and density from the 60's to the present along Gilman Drive.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT

AW: Thanks Justine Murray for a job extremely well done!

JuM: Will be working as Policy Director for newly elected Councilmember Raul Campillo.

5:48 Information Item #1: Draft Build-Out Report -- Katie Witherspoon

AW: Thanks KW for the very hard work in preparing the draft build-out report. The results look very slick but there are 1000s of database entries backing it up!

KW: Explains the purpose of this item. She will take away feedback and community comments. We will update the draft so we can have this as a baseline.

KW: CPU timeline:

- Adopted Community Plan (ACP) development potential tonight.
- Public facilities and safety in January
- Mobility in February

KW: Here is the high level overview of the Draft Build-Out Report (DBOR):

- Adopted Community Plan (1987) – what we have now.
- The Land Use Development Intensity Table of the ACP has 101 subareas. KW went through each subarea, broken down by parcel.
- Applied the City Prop D Coastal Height Limit Zoning, ALUCP to each parcel as applicable.
- Asked “what’s left?” given two scenarios: 1. ACP with CPIOZ/Land Use Development Intensity Table, and 2. ACP only.

KW: Will take questions now.

KR: How much development potential is available given the flight zone restrictions?

KW: All parcels were analyzed with respect to constraints that are now in effect. These do factor in existing overlays.

GL: Speaking of the 1987 plan, Harry Mathis and I did this by hand based on traffic studies.

KW: The Land Use and Development Intensity Table entries have been transitioned to VMT so things have changed. Plan amendments have been accounted for.

GL: Question on zoning ...

TG: In the past, the original single family zones were replaced by the intensity table using overlays. When a plan amendment is passed, zoning is updated. This is not done anymore, but will be cleaned up as part of the update.

GL: What about non-rezoned but still with potential development?

KW: Will have to check this out.

Ruth Kaplan: How about one-off parcel changes after the update is approved?

KW: The community plan amendment process is maintained, but we do not anticipate changes.

TG: The Development Intensity Table is a factor in the number of area plan amendments.

RRW: Comment: RM2-5 zone since 1969 changed to RM1-1 ...

AW: Following a comment in the chat by Neil Hyytinen, did you include MHPA and similar environmental restrictions in the analysis?

KW: Yes.

IK: Would the new plan be zoned such that there is no future need for plan amendments?

KW: The new zoning should remove the need for as many CPAs as we've seen recently since we work closely with all stakeholders through this process.

IK: If a parcel had a particular intensity and someone proposed a higher intensity for it, would the intensity be subtracted elsewhere?

KW: No.

KW: Back to base zoning analysis using the existing ACP. Elements include:

- ID of constraints.
- Tier analysis.
- Parcel level analysis.
- Non residential only.
- FAR used.

- AVR (Actual Value over Replacement value ratio) used.
- Outliers analyzed.

KW: Showed “Tier Maps”. Tiers numbered 1 to 4.

KW: Averaged over multiple parcels to estimate the likelihood of aggregate development, found 15.5 M Sq. Ft.

KW: Went into a more detailed analysis of Tiers 1 to 3 and explained additional methodology. When you boil it down, the remaining development using the development intensity table corresponds to the Focus Areas we have been using all along. This leaves about 7 M Sq. Ft. left for non-residential development.

Ruth Kaplan: Acres are easier to visualize.

KW: Sq. Ft. is the traditional (and best) measure. Measurement of buildings rather than land.

GL: [Looking at the map.] The light blue is mostly the “old” GA (General Atomics) site?

KW: Subarea 9 is a hard one to analyze.

GL: AVR – has this been used elsewhere in the City?

KW: Mira Mesa Plan Area.

GL: I understand the data, but how accurate is the data? Prop. 13 can cause the AVR to be very low. Wonders if AVR is valid under testing?

KW: Not sure it’s been tested this way. Can’t say it’s at the 90% confidence level, but it’s pretty good.

GL: Suggests that a current broker might be useful for verification.

TG: Can also look at buildings that have been reappraised earlier than 10 or 15 years ago. Dyett & Bhatia did some analysis for Mission Valley this way.

GL: If it’s been validated in Mission Valley, then it works here.

TG: It’s a future development indicator and likely good.

AW: If we are to stand on this, how reliable it is matters.

Question: the assumption on p. 26 referred to FAR 2.0 in the transition zone but you assume 0.5 FAR in your analysis. Why would companies not redevelop to 2.0 FAR?

KW: Trying to be conservative. Good to see higher FARs, but we try to model based on current development.

AW: How are estimates working so far?

KW: There are 5 CPAs in progress. Developers want flexibility when developing a site. Subarea 9 has the most potential.

AW: Not sure about your answer. You have parcel level analysis. How well does your estimation for specific parcels match to the proposed or approved projects for those same parcels?

KW: Development is constrained by what is allowed.

GL: DIT comment. Take the properties with greater than 1M Sq. Ft. There are many issues with each parcel, traffic, general difficulties. We should focus on the big parcels.

KW: Have our Focus Areas, with subarea 9 in FA 1. It shows why we chose the focus areas we did.

AW: If plan changes lead to removal of the DIT, then we have parcels with significant development potential that are outside of our Focus Areas and TPAs. East end of Governor Area is outside of TPA, likewise Eastgate and Miramar Rd Area. So, we would have two areas where we would have significant new development where the plan update goal is NOT to have more development.

KW: DIT is based on trips, does not apply anymore as we transition to VMT. Want future commercial development to be in TPAs but these areas are constrained. Area 9 has three parcels but not the flexibility we need. Focus area 3 and 4 will have the highest density but do not have much land left. The KMA report shows it's not what we need.

AW: Might be developing where we didn't expect it? What if development is at odds with the goals of the new plan, with CAP, etc.?

KW: We are hopeful the Trolley will be successful. We want mixed use development in FA 3 & 4. We aren't saying that zoning would be removed if outside TPAs.

AW: We are planning to remove one set of overlays (CPIOZs), but the City continues to use them in other plan areas. Are we planning to use new Overlay Zones to make sure the plan stays on track?

KW: It is something that could be considered.

DK: A fundamental question: Is the intent of the City that this (the removal of the DIT) is a discussion, or the way it is?

KW: The question is why we are removing it; VMTs are a primary reason, but land use scenarios are important for a 30 year plan.

DK: Could there be other constraints?

DK: Can be a huge benefit for current owners: a huge increase in value. What benefit does the City see? What benefit for the community? Land is increasing in value.

KW: We have not gone through the process of land use scenarios yet.

TG: We can talk about the most recent plans done, with urban design; these might be considered benefits independent of fees. Could be additional improvements here.

DK: "An issue to discuss" – with PMP update in progress as well, we are adding many people. Maybe

more park space comes from here. We do want to look at community equity. Downside as well as upside.

KW: I'd like to clarify that this is a baseline analysis for today. New plan will have updated zoning.

PK: The table misstates and misleads as it does not take into account the overall goals of the new plan.

KW: This is just a starting point. The new plan will take into account the CAP and other policies. This is not a first level pass at a new land use policy.

PK: Areas with potential to develop are not close to transit except for the purple zone (on the map).

GL: UCPG is considering Towne Center View project with a large increase in density. How will the tripling of square footage here be consistent with the new plan?

KW: It's technically a TPA.

GL: There is a 5.5 M sq. ft. development capacity (commercial).

KW: Results of housing analysis. There is some potential for ADUs. Residential in the core is pretty much built out. Reconciling all this is going to take work.

GL: We are not going to use the table from the 1987 plan. Would suggest existing zoning is a constraint. Need to look at the vision statement, maybe looking at the zoning in the center in terms of residential rather than retail.

KW: The intension is to update the land use and zoning to be consistent. It does make sense to locate residential close to the core.

KW: There is zero residential in subareas 1 through 101. The area has the greatest potential north of Rose Canyon. It is built out in both scenarios.

KW: New topic. Renaissance shopping plaza has the potential to be added as a focus area. Also, we should remove the east side of Genesee in focus area 3; these are condos.

AW: Thoughts?

KR: Renaissance is currently just commercial?

KR: There is not a lot of commercial density now. What kind of development are you looking at?

KW: There might be a similar situation at the shopping center along Arriba as an infill candidate.

DiM: Consider Renaissance as a mixed use residential/commercial?

KW: Yes, mixed use.

JS: Agrees that Renaissance and Vons shopping centers along Arriba as well could be part of a F A.

KW: The Vons is part of FA 4.

AW: Any objections to adding Renaissance to a FA?

[No objections.]

KW: Remove the east of Genesee condos?

GL: I object. Condos could be condemned by the City in future. We need to be bolder, the City needs to be thinking about this.

KW: Point noted. Condos in or not?

DK: Remove the condos.

AW: Don't think we have time to resolve this question tonight as it raises a more general question about condos and focus areas.

KW: We will discuss down the road.

AW: Please share comments or errors to staff. A balance between jobs and housing is a goal. We have huge potential for commercial development but almost no housing. There is a real imbalance between jobs and housing. Exponential growth in commercial won't get it done.

AW: Thanks to Katie Witherspoon again since we need this document as a baseline. We need to think about what's next. Stay safe, sane, and be well.

AW: Meeting adjourned at 7:35.