



## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, April 20, 2021

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), Laurie Phillips (LP), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Kris Kopensky (KK), Petr Krysl (PK), Abbey Reuter (AR), Carol Uribe (CU)

##### *Members not present:*

Kristin Camper (KC), Veronica Ayesta (VA)

##### *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, Citythinkers, Principle

Rick Barrett (RB) – Consultant, MIG, Inc.

Steven Davidovas (SD) – Consultant, MIG, Inc.

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein	(BB)
Nancy Groves	(NG)
Deanna Ratnikova	(DR)
Diane Ahern	(DA)
Jenna Renger	(JR)
Neil Hyytinen	(NH)
Kaitlyn Willoughby	(KWI)
Louis Rodolico	(LR)

David Campbell	(DC)
Alyssa Helper	(AH)
Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Andrew Barton	(AB)
Public member	(Public)

**5:36 Call the meeting to order by Andy Wiese, Chair**

Roll taken. 16 of 19 subcommittee members present

**5:39 SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT**

PK: [RE OCET. What is the role of the online survey in the selection of land use scenarios? There was a plan to solicit input from the public. This is dangerous. We have attended and seen many presentations; others have not had the benefit from this. We need to solicit input on questions in a way that is meaningful.

JS: <Missed Comment>

JM: Reminded the group that its membership is not representative of the whole community. It is important to receive feedback from the whole community through an online survey.

RRW: Likes JM comment. <Missed Remainder of Comment>

DK: Concerned about the process and discussions and about the draft plan and community. Has no idea if we have a unified plan. A great hole: housing, with no substantial discussion about it. Our housing is high-rise luxury. If we want affordable housing, there is no basis for it. Bike lanes are \$100M or \$50M: how to pay for it? The only definite plan is that land will become more valuable. What about the FBA? There is no plan for this. Otherwise, it's a fantasy island.

RC: DK brings up a good point. We've made requests from the City with no response. Good estimate of future fees is needed to avoid mistakes.

**5:46 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 18, 2021**

AW: Any corrections to the February 18 minutes?

DiM: I should have been shown as present for the February CPUS.

KR: Move to approve the February minutes with the DiM correction.

JS: Second.

AW: Call the for a vote to approve.

AW: Counts 11 Yes with no opposition.

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

### **5:39 SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT, Discussion**

AW: Katie, would you like to address the questions raised?

KW: I am using an iPad and a hot spot.

There are many elements going into the CPUS. There are many items, but I promise that the whole thing will come together. I understand the issue of community input outside of the CPUS; we'll find a way to make the information accessible to the community. We have been working on putting content into the OCET. The emphasis is less about the density as we know that's going to be there. We want to consider what is the appropriate mix of uses, retail, housing, parks, and so forth. We want to build scenarios, maybe three, for a focus area. What's the appropriate mix of uses? Less about the acquisition of density. The CPUS creates, the community inputs with diverse opinions, and we are trying to engage more people than attend the CPUS. COVID is a problem as it limits interactions. I understand your feedback, and I have not done this sooner. I will come back with responses. Land Use scenarios will be generated by the subcommittee, go to the PC as a workshop, come back to the UCPG, and then developed as preferred Land Use scenarios by the CPUS. We won't have a draft until winter, or early 2022. We'll need to come back then to the CPUS.

AW: Can you tell us if we are providing primary input? What do you specifically mean by that? What do the scenarios look like?

KW: I recognize the CPUS feedback is important. Content for the OCET will be shared in May, then back to reformulate. The structure of OCET will be text, like the old platform but the structure will be different. Content will be most important to feedback. All leads back to the survey.

AW: Will that be shared with enough time to review prior to the meeting?

KW: I need to talk to the consultants. Maybe a week; I need to connect with consultants.

AW: This is really important. Can we see similar surveys?

KW: It's not really possible to see, as we aren't live. It is a different vendor but consistent with our previous one. What can a Land Use Scenario look like? We will show them with different mixes, and can reset to this visually, maybe get feedback with DU/acre. Can see what the mixed-mode case looks like (sandbox).

AW: You defer to Diego and Rick.

KW: It's the content, not the tool itself.

DV: We are trying to make the things as robust as possible, and part of it has to do with March and early April feedback.

AW: Can you push the deadline so we can review it?

DV: We will try our best.

DK: Looked at the Mixed Mode plan with some visualization. If we don't have a concept of who lives in the housing, how is there reality to the visualization? If we don't have an idea of where the dollars come from, it's a fantasy. Where are the parks? I realize Diego is working on it, but I don't see how we get from here to there. If the plan is separate from reality, then we won't get what we need. I looked at the Balboa and Kearny Mesa plans. I want a very specific meeting on housing.

AW: I see comments from the chat. Can we have a conversation about housing prior to Land Use Scenarios?

KW: I'll respond to DK. With respect to housing, the Community Plan is a policy and Land Use Scenario map. The City wants housing in the core of North UC where there is the infrastructure. We add capacity for housing through the various elements. When we locate affordable housing and a mix of housing, we support the policy of a mix of housing types. Our plan will give the property owner the ability to develop the property, but the City affects the mix and density. We try to have a mix so that luxury does not freeze out lower priced units. Housing policy is City-wide, not just in the Community Plan area. We have RHNA targets that the CPU facilitates. Incentivizes affordable housing in conjunction with development.

DK: Read the Voice of San Diego article on 4/19 about removal of the height limit by Susan Baldwin. We have about all the housing needed in the upper income range, and some in lower income, and none in moderate income. The City is just replicating the luxury + 10% model. We need to discuss this otherwise we'll get more of the same. Very disturbing since it says a lot about the community.

BB: Everyone should know that the UCCA has a newsletter that can be used in many ways to help the CPUS. We have summer activities where people can meet. We can assist by sending out information.

KW: We need to be able to get to the presentation. Briefly, the Parks Master Plan and Infrastructure will be coming up soon. I don't have much to share on this by infrastructure project. We can have conversations about the DIF. I saw DK's email and don't have anything to share on this at this time.

AW: Housing views have been shared by Subcommittee members before.

## **6:10 Information Item #1: Urban Design Elements #2 – Diego Velasco**

DV: The meeting in March was productive. This is our first taste at discussing Land Use Scenarios (LUS). Housing is important. Early on we looked at discussing increased employment opportunities.

We'll look at:

- A Recap March
- B The Four Ps of Public Spaces
- C Land Use and mixed-use opportunities
- D Next Steps

I can stop after "B" and after each focus area.

In March we looked at FA 2, 3, 4, and 5 (and not really at FA 1).

Presentation proceeded with the following presentation slides.

Slide 5: FA2: Concepts were "clustering", and key elements were presented. Feedback was how do we make trails and the area accessible to the community, the architecture, and canyon edges.

Slide 6: FA3: UTC area concepts.

Slide 7: FA3: Executive Drive concepts, original slide.

Slide 8: FA3: Executive Drive concepts, revised slide showing correct buildings at Mandel Weiss Park.

Slide 9: FA4: La Jolla Village Square and Nobel Drive concepts.

Slide 10: FA5 Governor Drive / Genesee Ave. concepts.

In the concept plans, connections are very important to key Public Space opportunities.

Rick Barrett (RB): Showed "Key Public Space Opportunities" slide (#12, PDF deck page 21).

Plazas / Paseos / Promenades / Podiums are the four “Ps” in public spaces. Additional notes:  
Plazas connect transit to major areas.

Paseos are passages through superblocks by pedestrians and micro-mobility.

Promenades are extensions of the public Right-of-Way (ROW) with multiple forms of mobility linking various uses, for example, the plan for Executive Drive. Some ROWs would be enclosed. Podiums are parts of private developments open to the public. They are multi-level, usually associated with master planned communities.

## Q & A

AW: Most of the public realm is private. Would we write development plans so that these design elements are included? Do we have the tools?

KW: Yes, we do have power to include provisions via a CPOZ.

DV: There are precedents.

AW: We need to write these into guidelines, and we should have this conversation.

Jeana Renger (JR) On promenades, what happens on the public ROW affects private development. Where do they start, how wide are they, how long do they need to be to be impactful?

RB: Block by block, it depends on the location, filling the promenade to the available space. 10' to 15' extra ROW for public space, for example.

DV: 39' wide ROWs for Executive Drive.

JR: Are you narrowing the lanes?

SD: Yes, a road diet is done, but it's pretty flexible.

KW: You can look at the mobility corridors document.

DK: When you use private property for a promenade, for example, this uses a mix of public and private facilities. Who picks up the trash, maintains the streets, takes responsibility?

DV: Frontage improvements rest on the initial development, and in other instances there is a maintenance assessment district (MAD).

RB: Not one size fits all. At the 14<sup>th</sup> street promenade, every block is different, with different responsibilities.

JS: Are plazas at transit stops distinct from the actual stops?

DV: For UC, probably yes since transit is on platforms.

JS: Not enthusiastic about MTS's maintenance of their stops. At UCPG we heard some great office park projects. Most have very limited access to the public, so opening them up is a liability issue.

DV: I would say that the Community Plan is not the right forum to address this.

AW: Another “P” should be Parks. And another is ‘Public’ – not private spaces. We should think about park space, and where we put new housing, we should also put in new parks.

DV: Parks warrant their own discussion.

### **Key Land Use Questions and Focus Areas**

[See presentation slide #18, deck PDF page 27, “Key Land use Questions”]

DV: Public spaces are the Land Use “glue”:

1. What land uses should be emphasized?
2. What are the mixed-use opportunities?
3. Where should we encourage ground floor and transit actualization?
4. Where should we focus development?
5. How and where should public spaces be integrated?

Focus Area 1 (FA1) North Torrey Pines: [Slide presentation starts on slide #23, deck PDF 32.]

[#23] DV: Should new development focus on North Torrey Pines Road? I don’t know the answer. Or should development focus inward around campus nodes and clusters?

[#24] How are tech and science campuses changing? From office parks to innovation districts. Innovation district examples are the Manchester Innovation District downtown, Horton Plaza redevelopment, and SDSU West.

DK: Issue we run into is that the developers see this as a private reserve and don’t want the public. We need to resolve this conflict. Towne Centre View wants to close off the site.

DV: I see a lot of this. Fiefdom mentality.

DK: I don’t know if the City can afford it.

DV: Agreed.

LP: I looked at a lot of real estate for tech construction. There is an issue with uses at companies with proprietary information that can be exposed. Can’t have proprietary information exposed outdoors. It’s good to connect areas, but we need to respect privacy concerns.

DV: Should look into security.

DK: Need to look at this, as it’s important.

LP A serious problem downtown. Uses can be a big problem.

DV: Sounds like we need to drill down, particularly for Life Science, which has subcategory differences.

Jeff Dosick: Slowing traffic on North Torrey Pines is desirable.

JR: North Torrey Pines is wide, and there is a grade change between the road and the office buildings.

DV: We'll look more closely at that as it might be an opportunity.

LP: Agrees with Jeff's concerns, but it's the only connector north off the freeway, and is a major thoroughfare.

GL: I'm concerned; there is only one primary use. Proximity to Salk, UCSD, etc. We will find the same thing at Towne Centre View, e.g., there is only one golf course at 7PM. I don't think residential would work here.

Heil Hyttinen: Here is a comment relating to MX and Scientific Research. There might be a use outside of APZ2 for mixes that would include flexible designs, allowing residential.

AW: Access to trails, maintenance of access and both need to be reconciled with the privacy issue.

#### Focus Area 2 (FA2): Eastgate

[#28] DV: There is some residential here. Should we consider a different development pattern for the areas that touch transit? Eastgate Mall becomes a direct connection to the trolley stop. Is this area suitable as a "transit area"? Maybe this is an opportunity in the closest to transit areas. Could this be applied to even today's development?

[#31] With the current stations, what about residential focusing in this area?

[#32] Tech / Scientific Research in one side, residential on the other side of the slide. Can housing be included in this area?

LP: FA2 is one of those areas where density could be increased in housing without damaging the area's character. Some small transit would really help. Housing is condos, facing a raised trolley track. How is it going to be? Noisy? I don't know how higher density might be better.

AR: I would add that UCSD grad students live in this FA, so this would be ideal.

DiM: Supports the road diet on Eastgate Mall. On the condos next to the trolley on Genesee, ground level retail might be good.

DK: Condos on Genesee are right on the canyon, so there is really good habitat there. We need to address this almost vertical drop there (habitat impacts).

DV: We should focus more east on Eastgate Mall.

DK: Yes, little traffic there. Jet noise is significant.



JR: I second more mixed use in the area. It would improve the ratio of people / businesses.

AW: This is an area for future housing. Eastgate mall is quiet, maybe the *rambla* on Executive Drive would drive this residential. Question: Can housing compete with Scientific Research or offices in a MX zone, and at what price? If the options are luxury housing or Scientific Research, maybe we need a "residence zone" overlay.

DV: The group of condos are not included, my mistake.

Focus Area 3 (FA3): UTC / Core

DV: How do we better integrate employment uses with other uses in the area?

[#36] How do we integrate office into a primarily retail entry? Should we expand retail and active ground floor in mixed-use formats? Uses that surround the stations are critical. How do we activate the ground floor and extend to other areas? Then there is residential. The area is surrounded by existing residential, and this leads us to mixed-use. What kind of mixed use makes sense? There are different approaches, but the spaces between the buildings are key and the glue that makes it work.

[#42] Where should we focus development? How do buildings relate to one another, with retail, open space, etc. How are public spaces integrated?

DK: Diego, have you looked at Costa Verde? There is a whole design with inward focus. Then the Monte Verde buildings (two of four are built). You need to incorporate them.

DV: I have layered the Monte Verde buildings into the plan.

DK: There is a lot of shade in this area, and this is a problem. Monte Verde needs to allow through access by City requirement.

DV: We can model this.

JS: North of La Jolla Village Drive there is a connector on a roadway that connects directly to Executive Drive. Those strip malls would be mixed-use, dense retail, and high-rise. That particular area is good for further development.

DV: Regents Road, La Jolla Village Drive, Executive Drive.

JS: It does not go all the way through to Genesee.

NH: Costa Verde has mixed-use, hotel, retail, housing. It should have the same Land Use designation as other areas nearby.

DK: This is exactly the area where my comments on housing are most important. We will get luxury housing. I don't know how the City can do it differently but it's throwing away an opportunity.

DV: Another two-hour discussion ... Abbey Reuter pointed out that many grad students would use it. What can the Community Plan do?

AR: It's great to have more housing but there are many students per apartment due to cost. The

UTC side of UC San Diego is not welcoming to UCSD. A small park would be good, more welcoming.

AW: Critical for this area is how the Community Plan interfaces with UCSD. We many want to consider zoning-for-use there. Housing cost is important here. We need to understand how City incentivizes housing. We should have a conversation about planning not for the highest density at the start so developer's bonuses would create more affordable housing.

#### Focus Area 4: Nobel Drive Focus Area + Vons center

DV: Should office commercial be expanded (Nobel Drive)? How about the amount of retail? Should we think about mixed-use differently? Along streets, or internally as a Main Street? Residential surrounds the area, so incorporating residential is reasonable. Are there opportunities with a higher height limit? Where would we focus development?

[#52, #53, #54, #55, #56]

DK: This center has been through many cycles of development. What could go wrong? Last time, in 1987, it was foot traffic and superblocks. How much commercial can be handled?

DV: I agree, but it's not always possible to specify particular commercial uses.

AR: I used this area when I lived at UCSD and it is not friendly in the parking lots as a pedestrian. Walkability is very important on any redesign to get pedestrian circulation correct.

LP: Is higher density and removal of the height limit viable as part of the Community Plan?

DV: Tricky question. There is a City designation of a 30' height zone here. It's worth exploring but we should look at it.

GL: To me, it's a unique, well-serviced area. You have the trolley and I-5. It's a phenomenal property with more potential than any other area. We should get rid of the 30' height limit here by a vote of the people. I see the area as a potential area of focus.

JR: Makes lots of sense; the diagram makes sense.

LP: There would be a big advantage to a foot bridge between the east side of I-5 south of the temple and the west side at the Nobel commercial area.

IK: My experience is that what makes a city great is its public spaces. Now it's pathetic. I think we will regret not having these sorts of plazas. Please include circulation in these areas as part of the plan.

AW: I could imagine lifting the height limit here, but I do think Midway's [unlimited height limit] lift wouldn't be appropriate. Mixed-use could be a great benefit in some areas.

CU: La Jolla Village Square was an indoor mall. They never built walking areas that made sense.

#### Focus Area 5: Governor Drive

DV: We have focused on Genesee and Governor Drive. This is a good area for mixed-use. There are opportunities for residential. Perhaps residential above the retail?

GL: Should we also be thinking about Curie across the street? Maybe some middle-income housing here?

KW: Too many issues with this for the schools.

DiM: It's important to include for the area a reduction in the number of curb cuts from 7. I realize it's hard, but it should be included.

AW: I like the incorporation of a better connection to the south UC library. I would encourage you to include park space, and we can't forget to include parks along with housing. Making it better for kids would be of benefit to the residents. In the east (Gov Park) we should be careful about adding additional residents (because of the airport).

KW: It's 8:47 and time to sign-off.

AW: Thanks for the extra time!

**Adjourned.**