



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday September 25, 2021

Special Time 6:30 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

6:35 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), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Aidan Lin (AL), Carol Uribe (CU), Petr Krysl (PK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Laurie Phillips (LP), Veronica Ayesta(VA) (?)

Members not present:

Kristin Camper (KC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC)

ROLL CALL TO BE VERIFIED BY AW/KW

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) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department

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

Rick Barrett (RB) – Consultant, MIG principal

Ryan Mottau (RM) – Consultant, MIG Sr. Planner

Martin Flores (MF) – City of San Diego, Landscape Architect

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein (BB)

Nancy Groves (NG)

Diane Ahern (DA)

Kaitlyn Willoughby (KWI)

Isabelle Kay (IK)

Andrew Barton (AB)

Marcella Escobar Eck (MEE)

Neil Hyytinen (NH)

Jeff Dosick	(JD)
Tetsu Kidokuro	(TK)
Public member	(Public)

6:40 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – July 20, 2021

These minutes are not ready to approve.

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

6:40 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

DA – Fire Safe Council. On behalf of the University City Fire Safe Council, I'm thrilled to announce that the first Community Wildfire Protection Plan for University City has received approval from the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, the County Fire Safe Council, the County Fire Authority, and CAL Fire.

Some of us may feel that the possibility of being touched by wildfire in University City is slim. However, just today, there was a brush fire on Nobel Drive near the entrance to Miramar National Cemetery. Fortunately, it sparked during the day when many people were around and it was quickly extinguished. However, if it had sparked at night when there is little traffic and few people to observe and report, it could have easily gotten out of control. Thanks to our many firefighters who worked this fire and who reminded us that all it takes is one spark to start a fire.

On that note, I'm happy to share that our Fire Safe Council will host a public meeting via Zoom on Monday, September 27 at 6:30 PM. You are all invited.

We will also host a Fire Engine and information booth at Oktoberfest in Standley Park on Saturday, October 9.

I will put information about both events in the chat. Thanks so much. I hope to see you at both events.

BB – As a follow up to Diane's comment, October 9, 2021, has been declared Fire Safe Council Day by the City Council.

Elizabeth Fattah – Several years ago there was talk about a bus along Governor Dr. With the trolley, it made sense to have a minibus with a reasonable route. Has anyone put this idea out there given the talk about climate change?

AW – You should share with MTS. Your comment is noted.

6:45 Information Item #1: Overview of Land Use Scenarios – Katie Witherspoon

Values in [...] denote slide numbers from this meeting's presentation deck.

KW – I won't be monitoring the chat since I must present.

AW—I will monitor the chat. If there are lots of speakers, I might limit time per speaker.

KW – Schedule overview: [#4, #5]

- No meeting in October or November. Two virtual open houses.
- December will be OCET and workshops plus preliminary land use scenarios (LUS). (These could be shifted by one month.)
- January (February) Planning Commission Workshop.
- February (March) UCPG
- March (April) UCPUS preferred LUS.
- April (May) LUS public discussion.

KW – Focus Area (FA) maps. [#6]

For Focus Area 5, Governor Park (east end of Governor Dr.) the Fire Department has informed us that there would need to be an additional access road if the office park were to have a residential use. We are not proposing additional residential at this location as part of the plan update.

KW – Smart Growth Principles: [#7]

1. Mixed Land Use (Horizontal / Vertical, close by development)
2. Take advantage of compact design
3. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
4. Create walkable neighborhoods
5. Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place
6. Preserve green space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
7. Direct development towards existing communities
8. Provide a variety of transportation choices
9. Making development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective
10. Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions

KW – Implementing Smart Growth [#8]

1. Balance jobs and housing. Build out residential maximums first for analysis
2. Meet CAP goals. A smaller carbon footprint goes with density
3. Support transit infrastructure. (Use trolley wisely)
4. Diversity housing stock
5. Support industry and jobs

KW – Walksheds [#9]

The distance you can travel on foot at 3MPH from a trolley station in 5 and 10 minutes

KW – Residential Buildout Methodology [#10]

This slide explains calculations involving maximum dwelling units, size of residential buildout, and full residential buildout Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

KW – Non-Residential Buildout Methodology [#11]

This slide explains calculations like the residential buildout but involving non-residential FAR, maximum non-residential square feet buildout, and resulting number of jobs.

KW – Tiers Analysis [#11]

Evaluated potential for redevelopment based on tiers analysis conducted in the Adopted Plan Land Use Buildout Report

KW – Focus Areas:

KW went through each focus area and explained what each land use scenario option (A, B, or C) meant, with estimates for housing and jobs, and a rough visual look.

The focus areas are:

1. North Torrey Pines Employment Centers
2. Campus Pointe / Eastgate Mall
3. UTC Transit Village
4. Nobel Transit Village
(Note options A and B are without the 30' coastal height limit)
5. Governor Drive Community Village

KW – Summary:

	Population	Jobs	Jobs / Population
Existing	80K	26.5K	3.0
Option A	148K	80K	1.8
Option B	135K	60K	2.3
Option C	128K	44K	2.9

KW – Questions and Comments?

PK – I have trouble understanding reasoning behind focusing all the density on the vicinity of the trolley. It probably won't be the case that the trolley will be used in 100% of the transit trips in the area. What about cars/bikes/other transit? It's all in a narrow corridor in the area of the trolley. Why?

KW – If you look back at the walkshed slide [#9] in FA3/4, most are within a walkshed. This creates transit density infrastructure but supports all forms of transportation, bikes, busses, etc. There are many opportunities to connect to other forms of transit, for example, the Super Loop.

PK – Infrastructure is only the trolley and nothing else.

KW – It connects to downtown and supports other modes of transportation. There are many other ways to get around, so it supports those modes as well: bike, walk, and walk.

PK – If focus on trolley, we will have the density in places where no other mode of transportation will be viable.

KW – I'm not fully understanding the question but supporting the trolley does not exclude other modes. Connections extend to other modes of transit through transfers. There are connections to other modes supported by the entire proposed transportation network as outlined in the SANDAG regional plan.

KW – (JS Chat question on how many would like to live in a 1000 sq. ft. Dwelling Unit (DU)) A 1000 sq. ft. DU is quite large for 1BR or 2BR and allows multiple kinds of DU from micro units to somewhat larger units like 3BR to be represented by an average sq. ft. size.

JS – This is a huge amount of data! So many questions. It seems to me that for density and jobs analysis some suppositions don't work. I recall that many who work at UTC come from the north, so the trolley does not affect them, and they also don't live downtown. I fail to see that these DU will be occupied by people that work at UTC as opposed to a majority that will be occupied by students, for example. I don't see that units or locations create jobs. The data needs to be viewed considering our UCSD issues are a problem.

DK – I did look at the on-line tool. I'm happy that we are using walksheds so that leaves out Campus Pointe. They come to work from the north and don't use the trolley. It's impossible to judge how this works when it's divorced from parks, recreation centers, etc. It's divorced from the village since it isn't in the plan. I would like options between your current options and am concerned as Petr is about bike and general infrastructure. These people want to drive. I don't understand the planning part of this.

KW – I'd like to respond. I recognize that people live in north county. But larger density supports living nearby. We don't have information on a DIF "rebuild". These funds would be used citywide and in University. Where is the funding for planning? Good point. The trolley exists even though it's not used universally, and it will add options for transit.

RRW – Happy to see more DU to increase the homes / jobs balance. Housing is restricted due to the APZ. Happy to see so much emphasis on walking and recreation. In any case, the walkshed distances look like they were centered on La Jolla Village Drive. The transit stop

moved from north of Nobel to south of Nobel. It's one-half mile from La Jolla Village Drive. Your distances seem to be off by about a half-mile in both directions. Don't you think it should be from the transit center south? Looks like FA4 is different than the others.

KW – The center point is Nobel trolley station and looks a bit different. Focus areas do not take the place of TPAs. Focus areas use walkability measures and are distinct from TPAs. You can only cross I-5 on Nobel Drive, for example.

RRW – A ten-minute walk is a half-mile, which makes it further south about parallel to the Vons there.

KW – I think our map is accurate, as it is not as the crow flies but will check.

RRW – Some stores in La Jolla Village Square have doors to the south within 100 feet of the property line. It won't take 10 minutes to walk from the store to the property line.

GL – You started out with an FAR calculation. Is the object to look at residential build out, then the remainder is non-residential? Is the determining factor: maximize residential as best we can?

KW – Yes. There is a tiers analysis of likelihood to be redeveloped involved.

GL – This is the first time that's been explained. Suggest that you put residential and commercial FARs in the buildings.

KW – It's easier to put commercial FARs and residential DUs.

GL – The only place residential can be built is along Eastgate and along Genesee.

KW – Correct, I need to check with Tait and come back to the group.

GL – Summers Governor Park in FA5. There

KW – Difference is that Campus Pointe and Towne Centre are TPAs. You will find the answer in the cul-de-sac issues.

GL – West of Summers are many single family (SF) zones. Let's focus on FA1. There are two alternatives, higher density along Torrey Pines Rd., the other a campus. Is the idea to allow the area's owners to decide.

KW – If we eliminate the Land Use Intensity table, the build out would be for the entire area. The "choice" would be mostly an issue of design. Miramar APZs would dictate density in that area.

Madison Coleman – Climate Action Program Campaign:

- Will the CPU have an inclusionary housing requirement?
KW – We don't know how housing incentives will be incorporated; will be a CPOZ discussion
- Was Blueprint SD part of the Land Use Scenarios?
KW – We are not informed by Blueprint SD. We precede Blueprint along with Mira Mesa and Hillcrest and will form part of Blueprint's input.
- I did not see mode shift targets.
KW – We do not have them yet. EIR analyze the land uses as part of the process and would be able to tell us if the mode shifts meet the CAP goals.

Jeff Dosick – I have a different perspective. I am a thirty-year commuter by bike. I work now in north county and use the bike path parallel to I-5 from UCSD to Sorrento Valley to take the transit there. Why aren't we talking about the funding? For Mira Mesa, Eastgate Mall is the primary bike path to get to the trolley and is no longer viable. A Walkshed is planned, but no infrastructure for bikes. For us not to address the funding and bike infrastructure isn't good. How do we get funding into the "foreground" instead of the background?

KW – We do have a draft mobility network, including bikes, cars, and transit, and it is robust. Infrastructure funding will come and a DIF rebuild is coming, too. It's all a big process. The focus is on density now and choices are geared towards transit including the trolley and bikes.

Tom Hekman – A couple of things. I have heard many comments about living next to the trolley that are not realistic. We buy a home, and we change jobs to move up without moving. The transit model does not support the way things work. The density solution I'm cautious about since I lived in Tokyo. There are unintended consequences over a 25–30-year period. There is a high cost for infrastructure. A majority of people use cars, and when do they become important. The plan seems unrealistic. Opening up the south side of Summer (FA5) would be a bad idea for the people living there due to people going through the neighborhood as a shortcut.

KW – Not everyone will use transit, but the more that people do use transit will reduce car use. The housing density choice near trolley stations allows more choice.

KW – Answering a chat question from Katrine – Affordable or how income housing to be determined and done after a CPIOZ.

LP – When you present the density increases you need to consider UCSD's growth and its impacts on the surrounding community.

AL – Lots of perspectives have been shared. We should not discount UCSD. There are affordable housing concerns for students. I applaud higher density. Students contribute into the future. This requires affordable housing to be addressed. Students don't always need multi-family housing, but it's not static, either. Single family housing may not always be

supreme.

CU – Thinking about the density being proposed, Joe LaCava proposed 10000 units on 300 acres (of city property). It seems that this would be a better choice to rapidly increase housing since it's adjacent to existing infrastructure. 10000 homes vs 263: this sounds like we're thinking about doing a lot of modifications for not much reward.

AW – I looked at the material over the weekend. KW should be lauded. Ambitious. Sq. ft. for commercial is within range given the density. Housing is important and a concern of the community. A good starting point. The numbers are important, but also the mix, the affordability, and the quality of life. We are planning for the future and question before us is what do we owe to the future?

In general, options A and B are overbuilt, and here's why. The scale of density matters, and those proposals are on the high side in the aggregate for the sites. I took a calculator and a google map tool to estimate proposed population density for two areas, UTC, and La Jolla Village Square plus the Shops at La Jolla ("LJVSQ"). There are about 375 acres total, 90 for LJVSQ and 285 for UTC. About 4% of the plan area. Three times the current number of units in all of UC but on 4% of the land.

Option A: 80K new units, 469 people / acre at 2.2 people / DU.

Option B: 60K new units, 353 people / acre at 2.2 people / DU.

Density means different things to different people. Manhattan is 110 people/acre vs 469 in our two focus areas. Upper West Side is 171 people/acre. We are looking at a scaling three-four times that of Manhattan, twice or more the Upper West Side of Manhattan. This is very dense; the population numbers are out of balance. We have lots of commercial, undifferentiated here with a predicted high-rise density effect on housing, with a small number of affordable units with a large number of luxury units. In the best case we would have 75% of the trips by car. The proposals suggest to me an auto-dominant Manhattan, but at 3-4 times the density and without Central Park. We need to think about scaling those back. A good example of that is on the east campus of UCSD where they have built about 4300 beds on 30 acres which is 143 people / acre. This is an example of good, sustainable planning, exactly what we are looking for UC. I would recommend we revise the top end and option B in LJVSQ. I would recommend we institute a Public Benefits Planning for the increased value.

I am concerned about the jobs / housing mismatch. Even if we add 176K people to UC in the next 25 years, we'd still be pushing out our mismatch into the future with consequences to our Climate Action Plan. I would argue that we revise option B in LJVSQ with at least a housing option that preserves the retail nature of the area. In my view, housing is the key in the revision of the city Coastal Height Limit and not just develop the area for commercial use. Densities like Mesa Nueva would be a good option for this area.

Small / medium / large is what we get with the survey, or medium, high, and super-high. We need to give people more qualitative options to choose from to avoid just a gut reaction choice.

We need to get real with parks and try to get the best match of people and parks.

KW – We can talk in private but there are about 1100 acres in the focus areas. If we look at

53,500 (not 80,000) additional housing people at 2.2 people/household, that's 104 people / acre and not at all Manhattan level. There are some 20 or 25 story buildings that make sense, but there is no way we get a Manhattan. There might be greater nuance if we remove one or two focus areas from the calculations. Greatest number we show is 290 / acre, and that's on some small parcels.

KW – We will move on now to Ryan Mottau (RM) (pronounced Mat toh', accent on last syllable).

RM – Walks through the on-line engagement tool (OCET). It will work as well on a phone as a computer or laptop. The subcommittee has worked on an earlier version this.

RM – I'm happy to take questions.

AW – This is the first public roll-out of this. There was a first roll-out to the panelists as they got the OCET link last week. Extensive outreach will occur.

KW – We are looking at adding an "other" option, where maybe you type in your response.

DK – I had a hard time figuring out the tool. I like to look at everything first before making choices. I looked at one area, didn't like A or B, but could not go on without selecting an option. Everything is called a "village". Too "planner jargon-y". Real descriptions, please. South UC is very confusing, as it looks like it combines the two separate areas and treated them as one. The visuals don't work.

KW – Give me one positive thing, and then you can give me all the bad things. The "village" comes from the City of Villages from the San Diego General Plan. So I get the comment and your point is noted.

GL – It is reasonably easy to use, comprehensive, and I would like to see all focus areas first, then you get the idea, then go back and fill in the rest.

VA – Thanks for the effort and you tried to include lots of detail that came from the meetings. The "other" option is important, so thanks for taking that into consideration. When you go into the descriptions, we need something more realistic and detailed. As mentioned by Debby, seeing all or part of the survey first then returning to fill in the answers would be most helpful.

RRW – Thanks, very informative and I appreciate the detail that the planners will be studying. I am wondering if other areas in the future would be studied. To be honest, since I knew the results wouldn't be considered I did not fill out the survey. I wonder why areas in TPAs were excluded from focus areas? Some properties that originally were not TPAs are TPAs. Is there a problem with the city considering areas whose name does not include "village"? If a property owner requested change to a village land use would their property be considered? If the property had a neighborhood village land use, would the city then consider it?

KW – Once I come back to the CPU subcommittee with the results, we will have different scenarios coming back. This is when land uses outside of the FAs would be discussed. Any discussion on those areas would be discussed at that point. We spent a lot of time refining the FA concepts and were determined after a long period of consideration.

CU – Tool would be easier if there was a shadow or outline for what's there now as an overlay. When you show a complex and what is envisioned, could you place an outline of what's there so we can visualize in a simpler manner. What it looks like now vs. proposed.

BB – I'm interested in how non-experts respond to the survey. I am really interested to see who's expected to respond to the survey: all residents, business owners, people who work in the area? Are we talking about 50-60K respondents? Some who are not familiar with the concepts at all. UCCA is ready to help respondents. Are we planning to make this available to the maximum number of people: residents, business members, workers, UCSD students?

KW – We do have a robust strategy for outreach: partnering with UCSD via AL and AD, and the UCCA. We're trying to reach as many as possible. Mira Mesa got about 1000 verified responses. We want more, and we want a diverse, representative group of respondents. Tables, town halls, and many other forms of engagement. We will be doing engagement the whole month of October. Give me your ideas for outreach. Say hello if you see us!

AW – We'll end on that positive note. Share the word. Thank you, Katie. This is a hard thing to advocate for the thing you believe in in front of an audience and on behalf of the project, so my hat's off to you!

KR – Do we know when the next meeting will be?

KW – I don't know when the next meeting will be. December or January; will talk to Chris and Andy. Thanks to all the team here tonight [list at the beginning].

Adjourned at 8:50 PM.