



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday February 15, 2022

Regular Time 6:00 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

6:05 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), Petr Krysl (PK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Laurie Phillips (LP), Kristin Camper (KC), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC)

Members not present:

Kris Kopensky (KK), Carol Uribe (CU)

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

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

City Staff:

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

Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department

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) |

6:05 Call to Order – Chair Andy Wiese

6:06 Roll Call – Chair Andy Wiese

See list of members present and absent above.

6:11 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – July 20, 2021

Call for modification – none.

DiM moved to approve the minutes.

LP seconded the approval of the minutes.

No further discussion.

Vote: 12 Yes, 0 No, Abstain 0

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

6:12 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

JS: Wants to call people's attention to Andy Wiese's comments from prior meeting on Focus Area 4 comparing the numbers in Manhattan versus proposed numbers in UC. What we are envisioning is an auto-dominant Manhattan at four times the density without Central Park. Useful to consider.

Isaac Lara: UC resident and employee. I like the survey and like to see the community move forward with high density housing.

Paulette Williams: We will hear about UC redesign. I found the survey unfair as it clearly leaned heavily towards North UC. [Remainder of comment deferred until the agenda item.]

Anita Wilson: Only 24% participated in the survey as participants so it seems that you are making revisions based on a minority of residents. [Remainder of the comment deferred until the agenda item.]

DK: Please post the meeting recording right away.

KW: Yes, as soon as possible, perhaps as early as next week

6:25 Information Item #1: Overview of Land Use Scenarios – Katie Witherspoon

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

KW: [(Slide) #4] Review the upcoming schedule:

| | |
|------------|---|
| Feb | OCET, Land Use Scenarios (LUS) #1 |
| Mar | Feedback on LUS #2 |
| Apr | Feedback on LUS #3, vote on preferred and alternate scenarios |
| May | Planning Commission Workshop |
| June/July | Adoption of preferred, alternate scenarios by UCPG |
| June/July | Community benefits and CPIOZ |
| Spring '23 | Final Plan adoption |

KW: [#7] Review what the plan can and cannot do.

[#9] Review work to be completed.

[#11] Review survey outreach results.

[#12] Review outreach efforts.

[#13] 2019 survey had 1000 complete responses out of 1700 with some response.

[#13] 2021 survey had 2650 complete responses out of 7000 with some response.

[#14] Review age and ethnicity, 2019 vs 2021.

[#15] 2019 age breakdown, 2019 age data wasn't collected.

[#16] Age with community demographic comparison

[#17] Respondent's connection to community

[#18/#19] North Torrey Pines research Focus Area. Not much housing to be allowed due to height limit, APZ 1 and 2, and Transition Zone (TZ). 60% of respondents selected Option A, 40% selected Option B. 0 homes for this area.

[#21/#22] FA2 (Campus Pointe/Towne Centre): part is in APZ 2 and TZ, so some co-location of housing with jobs is possible. 50% A, 26% B, 22% C.

[#24/#25] FA3 (UTC) Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is a priority. 50% A, 21% B, 29% C. Note the values on this slide for jobs or housing are totals, including existing.

[#27/#28] FA4 (Nobel east and west of I-5). Includes height limit (Option C) to the west, no height limit to the west (Option A and Option B), and no height limit to the east. Area has a low-density hotel; we are looking at mixed use. 50% A, 22% B, 28% C.

{#30/#31} FA5 (South UC, Governor and Genesee, Governor and Regents). Community Village Medium / Neighborhood Village Medium/Low. Option A 60%, option B 40%.

[#33] Survey Results / Outreach Summary for all five focus areas.

KW: Comments?

Carol Parham: Were schools contacted about SD Unified issues involving the plan update?

KW: We have quarterly check in calls with SD Unified and keep apprised of issues involving planning and the schools.

Petr Krysl: There is a serious problem with the survey since it asks for the opinion of respondents about density by asking about housing but does not ask about livability and so did not ask about parks, libraries, open space, schools, and so forth. There are 60K current residents with our current 70 acres of parks. With 100K new residents, we'll need more than twice this acreage. If there is nothing about parks in the plan, parks will not be built. This is asking about more houses without addressing livability.

JS: My concern is with housing type (luxury) being built. We see all new construction is luxury. We have to realize that luxury will be the goal for developers in their building plans. How do we ensure that all income levels are accommodated? I did not choose to live in an all-luxury community; we need low and moderate incomes. We need to tie in affordability with land use.

DiM: What would be the incremental increase in housing via removal of the intensity table in the existing community plan? How about the Banker's Hill lawsuit? A lay person's reading of the lawsuit would indicate that a 15% affordable component could produce double the entitlement.

KW: I don't know about the Banker's Hill lawsuit, but there is no remaining housing capacity after removing the intensity table in University.

AL: I want to thank KW and staff and wanted to give them praise. I want to address sentiments regarding students and renters and not treating them as a part of the community. When you talk about community involvement, people took time out of their day to do the survey. Want to thank all that completed the survey. About luxury housing, we need to make sure we provide short term relief to those that need housing now but disagree with the argument being used to block all high-density development. As we develop a plan that lasts decades, that luxury housing degrades into lower priced housing. If we don't build the high-density housing now, we never solve the problem in the long term. I know renters that need help now, but we don't want to block development that is important for the future.

Jennifer Crabil: South UC resident. 70% of the respondents were residents? Do you know the number of complete surveys that were residents?

KW: Figures are complete responses only.

Jennifer Crabil: What are the implications of the survey for decision makers?

KW: It's a tool in the toolbox and was a robust survey. We took all engagement and reported that out. The survey was non-scientific, but it helps us with community opinion. Engagement, for example, is public meetings, tabling, advertising, door hangers, etc. The survey does not make decisions but helps guide us.

David Brodie: UC resident. I want to thank the subcommittee for the work for the past few years and Katie Witherspoon. This is a Governor comment, applying to the west end and proposed changes to the west commercial area. There needs to be a plan to show how you can do this without high rises. We don't have an idea of the impact on traffic of development. The west side is the only area with small businesses. How much will the adding of residences exclude businesses? Could a developer decide that renting to businesses is not profitable and decide to make only residential? There used to be four corners of businesses, now there are two. So, it's a concern. The survey on p. 59 has homes at 1000 for option A, 750 for option B. But no option for "none of the above". There were 112 comments for no change, with 121 wanting change on page 61.

AW: We did have a conversation about quantifying "no change" or "neither" with KW. Were these quantified in the total numbers, so we know what the proportion of survey respondents chose no preference or "neither"?

KW: Each comment was tagged if it was "no change". You could select neither option A nor option B and record your opinion in the comments instead. We take each comment seriously. The plan update is a plan for the next 30-40 years, so "no change" isn't a viable option. We need to have your constructive proposals and alternatives to engage.

AW: The "N" in the survey that totals responses includes only those who chose Option A or Option B or Option C and those who said other or neither? Or only the options?

KW: On the second page is where we reported no-change; if you did not make an option selection, it was not recorded on the overall more quantitative report out. The way we reported out is reflected in the way the survey was structured.

Don Fitch: Who's behind pushing high density housing? Katie Witherspoon, do you live here? Aidan Lin, ...

KW: <Cut off the previous speaker>. This is not going in a positive direction.

The plan update is a long time coming. We have a housing deficit. We are not just looking at high density housing but are looking at all options. We are really looking at what affordability looks like in the plan, and the next step in the process would include overlay zones for affordability.

Paulette Williams: Tonight, we heard about the redesign of UC; the survey heavily leaned towards North UC. I documented this on Nextdoor five days ago. Who compiled the survey? Who biased it towards NUC? Every other area had three options; South UC had two.

AW: Significant outreach was done everywhere; this should be recognized. There were tabling events, flyers, announcements in the UCCA newsletter, doorhangers, and more. Katie, do you want to respond to the two choices for SUC?

KW: We did a lot of surveying in SUC. 75% of residents live in NUC, 25% in SUC. We were looking for a match b/n infrastructure and the survey. Canvassing was done in both NUC and SUC. We are a small and limited team and worked hard to get the survey out. We used a method that notified the parents of each child enrolled in the schools to participate in the survey.

RC: Surveys are biased but there are selections to be made. Picking apart the survey will be very helpful in seeing how people responded. Without context, it's hard to decide about density. Density includes parks, transportation, housing, commercial and all of them mix to produce their effects. Maybe we need to look more at what kind of density is supported by infrastructure and what kind of infrastructure supports density. UC San Diego is partly a problem. I have taught students and graduate students all my life, and my advice to students is go to the university and get them to prioritize housing. I don't agree that luxury housing gets cheaper; this does not go with my experience. What we really need is a guideline that is very explicit about the percentage of affordable housing that would result.

Ruth DeSantis: SUC resident. I echo Roger Cavanaugh's comments. The increase in students who turn to local housing is a problem. The city should push back. In the survey, all choices in SUC increase density without increasing infrastructure. No Regents Road Bridge available. No Genesee widening. I was forced to make an option for us "no change". Others felt the same.

Jena Belin: SUC resident. I did the survey, did not like the choices. One thing not taken into account is the difference between NUC and SUC. Many livability issues, losing small businesses in the Sprouts shopping center in the plan. I don't want to live in an urban community. Any housing that is built needs to take into account that lots of older people live in SUC, whereas there are a lot of students in NUC. I'm greatly concerned about what's happening in the community now.

KJ: Thanks to KW for her efforts and outreach. 2000 survey responses aren't adequate. Not a good sample size, not representing the true opinion of SUC. Probably the "none of the above" accounts for the majority of responses. I live in SUC and work at UCSD. UCSD is playing a major role in housing students. Still, what the students are asking for may not be best for the community.

JS: We've looked at five Focus Areas. What we do now is consider how to best use the information. What effect does FA development have on the non-focus areas? End of Governor, many other pockets to examine. How will land use be affected if these "smaller" areas are built out? Will this make the density problem bigger?

KW: Part of this is a segue into Land Use Scenarios, and how land use is integrated over the entire plan area.

JS: Assume a full buildout. I would like to know the total density.

DK: Survey: The link sent did not work early in the survey. My earliest job was protecting low-income residents against urban renewal. Market forces are the rule. Transit riders aren't high propensity of high-income. Do students qualify for low-income housing? A 10-15% low income, 80% high income mix won't work. This isn't diverse. Respondents were 30% students. We are doing a long-range plan, and their weight is too much. 70% of people who want option "A" lived here less than one year. I would expect that if I lived here less than a year that people would pay less attention to me than someone who had lived here longer. Roger Cavanaugh spoke of parks, open space and infrastructure that is necessary for this plan. No parks, all density. People need parks, rec centers, and so forth. Habitat preserves are important. Land Use needs context to be meaningful.

AW: We must look at the city proposal in agenda item #2.

KW: [#35] Summarizes the current adopted plan land use.

[#36] Explains Neighborhood, Community, and Urban Village land uses. These are new.

[#37] Campus Pointe and Towne Centre Drive Employment areas.

[#38] FA1 / FA2

[#39] Base scenarios Scenario 1 Scenario 2
Hatching implies co-location of housing allowed.

[#41] Shows a 10-minute walk shed from transit.

[#42] Feedback on community core FA3.

[#43] Proposed scenarios for FA3

[#44 - #47] LUS for Community Core

[#48] Proposed scenarios for South UC.

[#49] "Townhome" land use for sections of south UC. "Townhome" is an up to 4 units/parcel (assuming certain parcel attributes) zone.

{#53} Scenario 1 proposed land use.

[#54] Scenario 2 proposed land use.

AW: The floor is open for discussion.

PK: I saw KW present the plan. There is no green space or park space, only purple color. What in the plan is included to make a livable neighborhood? All things point to existing facilities without additional green spaces or libraries. How do we plan density this way without additional plans for livability?

KW: Martin Flores is going through the parks plan now. Parks will be included.

LP: If the University of California purchases land, does the property become governed by state rules, and is it excluded from the University Plan Update? Height limit removed, higher density allowed? This might have additional impacts from density that was not planned for in the CPU.

KW: Yes, the University of California represents the state. The Rock Bottom site [La Jolla Innovation Center] gives you the formula. UC San Diego has not typically used this power.

DiM: I support increased density. I have a hard time figuring out how to vote for this absent transportation, parks, and other improvements.

KW: Mira Mesa could have voted on traditional land use scenarios, but their subcommittee tentatively approved their scenarios pending further analysis. The entire draft plan will be considered later. There is also an option for the subcommittee to develop an option that is analyzed along with the city's scenarios.

DiM: Could you comment on how improvements relate to development.

KW: Build Better San Diego (BBSO) covers this, but I don't have further information.

AD: There was a comment on UCSD housing. There is a Long-Range Development Plan. UCSD will provide 65% of student housing after buildout. We provide 40% now. Completed 2000 beds during the pandemic, have 2000 beds under construction, and plans now for 2000 + 1300. We want to provide a four-year guarantee of housing on admission. When students provide their input, they demonstrate similar needs to the community. Students may be transitory, but their needs are consistent longer term, so these need to be recognized by the community and their opinions considered.

JS: I'd like to follow up with PK's comment; this is sort of a chicken and egg situation. You mentioned an alternate land use scenario? How would you do that practically?

KW: I can get information for you on this and follow up.

JS: I have a lot of digesting to do and would like to keep options open.

AL: I'd like to thank AD for her comments. We're here because we're asked, and we want to be with you during this process. We will get more information on parks, I'm sure. I want to note that we made a \$2B investment in the trolley. Higher density development scenarios do a good job of capturing this investment.

KC: One thing I noted. Part of the area that's labeled open space in the plan is actually federal property (Miramar/VA Cemetery). Please update your maps.

AW: I'd like to thank KW for the hard work of taking the questions. Please identify which mixed use zones in urban villages are which, RMX or EMX. This helps clarify which areas are likely to accommodate housing, and which not. We want to make sure that there are real numbers for housing. Areas that are Scientific Research (SR) are likely to stay that way, so the likelihood is zero housing and projections should reflect that. Please provide sq. ft. as opposed

to only number of jobs so we can understand the proportions better. We need an understanding of the balances in the commercial areas, for example, SR vs. housing proportion. We need an affordable housing minimum over the entire UC area. For the record, there is no reason to expect that housing for the rich filters to anyone but the rich, so we need to build in affordable housing explicitly. Questions/comments: Does scenario 1 represent base land use or with bonus under a CPIOZ? For Nobel village west of I-5, tech is not a good use. This should have a lot of housing and affordable housing plus retail-commercial. We have lots of SR elsewhere in the plan area. For Genesee and Nobel, southwest corner, this is the most affordable area in UC now, with 2/3 people of color, and under option A this would be luxury and displacing the lower income residents who live there. Displacement here is no more acceptable than anywhere else in the city. The southwest UC proposal for townhome zoning is a bad idea, good politics but bad planning. This will be auto dominant. There is a lot here, and thanks for giving us the time to chew on it.

KJ: The Nobel space to me does not have egress to and from the freeway. Adding high density here is going to be problematic. This is a huge mess, and I don't know how it is to be resolved.

DK: I feel that I barely comprehend what KW proposed. What are the next steps? What should we do now with this information?

KW: I wanted to have this conversation first. I expect you to review the LUS, come prepared for the next meeting. You can hold subcommittee meetings yourselves. Challenging, but I won't present anything new next month.

DK: The Governor drive thing at the end: There will be a big negative reaction to this. This is extremely disturbing and a problem having it piled onto all of this. I don't know where it came from.

KW: Your comment is noted.

JS: I suspect SB9 is because it's the new reality. We need to know what other areas that are subject to SB9.

Leona Cortez: UC resident and employee. Echo Ernesto Lara from before. This is a plan update valid over a long period, so we need to consider students and renters. There will always be students here, so we need to not regard them as transient but representative with real needs. I ask the subcommittee to follow through with this amazing public input and continue to develop the plan update.

Paul Jamison: Speaking as a housing advocate to support the outreach. It's so hard to get real representation in a survey, and some attacks are unfair. We need student involvement. Even a small amount of affordable housing will be better than none. Many comments are against density in general. The \$2B spent on the trolley was not mentioned until AL did. Some

want to preserve a suburban lifestyle, but we can't prioritize that over housing when people need it so badly. I do support high density options; "no change" is directly harmful to the community.

Tommy Jung: UC employee. We need to make sure that voices that aren't normally heard are heard. UC employees are part of the community. UC San Diego is not just students, but also 28K staff members. Housing should be available for them as well.

Armando Tovar: SB9 proposed areas: how were they done? Is the plan to allow them, or purchase houses up and make townhomes?

AW: Overall, the plan provides the rules for development; it does not do the development itself.

Ethan Cohen: Thanks for the 2-3 years of work. Understands the needs of students, renters, and lower income groups. We need to realize that for those in south UC, changes are all in North UC. We need to see how development is handled in NUC prior to applying to SUC. I don't see the same benefit (DIF/FBA) in SUC as NUC as they are quite different. North and South Pacific Beach is the same way.

AW: Thanks to all who contributed respectfully. These are matters that matter to each of us, and because they matter, we hold opinions that are strong and often passionately expressed. We can express them agreeably. Thanks to KW for a difficult job well done. We don't agree all the time, but I don't disagree with the hard work and facts she brings. A community plan is a message in a bottle to the future. We'll be judged on the message it contains. Thank you.

8:23 ADJOURNED.