



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday March 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), Aidan Lin (AL), Petr Krysl (PK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU), Jason Morehead (JM)

Members not present:

Kris Kopensky (KK), Kristin Camper (KC), 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:

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)
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.
Fourteen members present.

6:11 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – September 25, 2021

Call for modification – none.
PK moved to approve the minutes.
CU seconded the approval of the minutes.

No further discussion.

Vote: Unanimous to approve.

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

6:11 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

RC: Comment on affordable housing. Some developers will propose and build larger amounts of affordable housing than we usually see. Today's announcement by the Mayor and City Council confirms that interest. We should decide what our mix should look like. This is a political process, and I'd suggest we look at the figures to see what the numbers look like for a distribution of income levels for housing.

Robert Snitzer: I've lived in UC for 41 years. Roads cannot handle any more traffic. Plenty who live here now are 100% for no more growth. Where was "none of the above" in the survey?

RRW: I'm speaking about March 8 UCPG meeting, agenda item 9. There was some evidence submitted by the UCPG and public that were contrary to the City Planners report and the biological technical report for the Coastal Rail Trail, Gilman Dr. segment, and the property was labeled to by one member as "core MSCP" whereas the city report, per City Planners and AECOM consultants, pages 22 and 23 of the report states that the Gilman Drive segment is highly developed, extremely dense development with landscaping that is a barrier to wildlife movement. A member stated that approval of the CPAI (Community Plan amendment initiation) would require a significant amount of the MHPA, and its boundaries moved, whereas Applicant's biological consultant who has studied this property for over 10 years showed that 7.7 acres of developable land outside the MHPA. Another member of the committee stated that there were 3 pairs of CAGN (CA Gnatcatcher), whereas there is only one pair in the report

dated 2018. The report stated that the property was a developed area with barriers to wildlife movement.

Cheryl Stigal: Why are there no in-person meetings scheduled? COVID numbers are down; virtual meetings are low engagement, and there could be a zoom element as well.

James Binley: My wife Siri is a business owner and wonders when the development could start and what kind of compensations she might receive when it happens.

Lisa Heikoff: Lots of new information was added on at the end of the last meeting. I would also advocate for in-person meetings where we can see charts and maps and talk directly to city planners. The materials by zoom are small and don't make it easy to understand.

Snezana Milutina: It is shocking what I saw, and I would like to know what I can expect? Do I have a choice to say no?

Lisa Brezina: I'm on the same page as Snezana. Who is in control of the decision process? What options other than A, B, or C? Who is ultimately in control? I don't believe we are. This needs to be clarified.

6:25 Information Item #1: Feedback on Land Use Scenarios – Katie Witherspoon/Suchi Lukes

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

SL: [(Slide) #3] Review the upcoming schedule:

Spring	OCET, Land Use Scenarios.
May	Planning Commission Workshop
Summer	CPIOZ
Spring '23	Final Plan adoption

KW: [#8] To be completed list.
We will stop at various points for comments.

DK: SL presented many documents here; can I get a list?

KW: Yes, these documents may not be final, but we have the list.

PK: I'd like to address the point raised by SL. I'm concerned that the survey was completed by too few, because they could not ask for help, or similar. Looks good on paper, but it's imperative for the city to build in more in-person meetings so people can provide input.

KW: We are working through the process. Probably no vote in April. We are working to identify the pattern of meetings with respect to in-person and virtual. We will have more information as policy is worked out. We want to be available for feedback.

JS: It would be helpful to me if you would explain and render the concepts, keeping as basic as possible. Density and people (population), for example.

KW: Absolutely.

LP: A process question to Suchi. At what point does analysis affect traffic? This is a follow-on to JS's comment: missing definitions on housing, for example. Agree with Joann, this seems backwards. We should know what the traffic is prior to approval. We need to know the definition of affordable housing, jobs/housing ratio, and so forth. Low-income housing can be expensive, and income ranges are pretty middle class.

[#14] Scenario 2 proposed land use. 140K jobs, 62K Homes, 2.26 jobs/housing ratio

KW: The process of selecting a land use is iterative. It does not mean that we aren't also planning for parks and open space.

[#15] Non-residential demand. This slide is an updated in 2020 Keyser Marston slide. There is 22M sq. ft. of existing non-residential development. Through 2050 there is a projected 42M sq. ft. total of non-residential development under Scenario 1, with 39.2M sq. ft. under Scenario 2.

KW: Pause for comments.

AW: Could you give us the conversion of jobs to sq. ft.?

KW: It varies, but generally 300 sq. ft. / employee for office, with light industrial and scientific research more, maybe 1000 sq. ft. / employee, and retail lower.

AW: I note that the two proposed scenarios have commercial square footage targets that are something like 25-50% higher than the high end of the Keyser Marston projection of need [with benefit of calculator: 20-40%]. Why are the proposed scenarios higher than the projected highest need?

KW: This is a range of proposed development, until 2053, so there is some variation in what the numbers mean. A jobs projection of 140-150K jobs. I can't explain why these are not exact numbers, but these numbers are likely close to accommodate the highest need.

JS: With those projections, do you know what sectors they are in?

KW: There is a breakdown in the website materials, planuniversity.org/materials.

JS: Can that demand be accommodated in current non-residential?

KW: With today's plan, commercial is highly constrained and the community is built out.

JS: I'd like to know how much more acreage we'd need to satisfy demand, a backwards approach.

DK: We have the high projection and low projection with a 6M difference. Does this consider that a lot of the building that life sciences want is low-medium rise, and not high rise and that means there needs to be more land to develop these sites?

KW: 6M sq. ft. isn't nothing, you're right. We know University spatially can't go out and must go up. The remaining land is protected open space and we're not proposing anything there. Part of low rise is restricted height, but what we see other cities is that it is something that people are interested in. Can't generalize about height at this point.

KW: South UC: The base scenario is on [#17], and the proposed scenario is [#18]. We will have some visualization at the next meeting.

IK: Zones?

KW: Zones implement the various land uses; overlays add additional restrictions and requirements. The city is working through the SB9 implementation through zoning code, 4 units / lot density. For discussion at this point.

KW: KR had a TPA question. SB9 does not apply in high fire zones. TPA is a smaller piece of the south UC proposed changes [#20]. The extended pieces to the east and west are for study. Parking requirements may be included.

PK: I'm flabbergasted. Why have high density development without transit access?

KW: There is no trolley, but there is public transit access via bus line within a half mile buffer.

PK: You can't walk to the trolley.

KW: Petr, not to the trolley, but to a bus stop at Governor & Genesee.

PK: You still need two busses to get to a trolley. Total nonsense.

KW: Not everyone takes a bus to a trolley. That's not the way TPAs are defined.

AW: The spirit of the comment is that bus transit is less than desirable here – long lead times, no evening or weekend service, downtown express recently cut, etc. It does have public transportation, but it's poor.

KR: Townhome proposal: we are looking at an SB9 lot split, if this is 5000 sq ft minimum for each of 4 units and a person wanting to split live in one of the homes. Why do we need an overlay zone for this? Why not leave it as it is, and if someone wants to lot split, then fine.

KW: I do not believe if the proposal were implemented through specific land use that it would require owner occupancy.

KR: Won't be a popular option and probably would not require owner occupancy.

AW: In what other ways does this land use proposal differ from SB9?

KW: The housing package specifies this and is more by right.

KW: There are intricacies in SB9 that need to be taken into account.

CU: If you propose to split a lot, tear down one home, put up two homes. Could further tax infrastructure. Might be better to create new communities from surplus city land.

KW: Comment taken.

DK: We need to look at the definition of transit; SUC does not meet that. There are many defects in the current bus schedule. So maybe TPA does not apply. SB9 has a number of protections for development, not like what's being proposed with townhome zoning. The community needs to know what the differences are between SB9 protections and the city proposal, and if you did away with SB9, what would you be facing?

LP: Having spent much of the last two years evaluating land for BMS [Bristol Meyers Squibb], we rejected many properties > 5 stories. Three stories are good, but not much higher. There are issues with construction. As we evaluate work from home, these jobs are legal, general administration, finance, etc. A 60-40 split between lab/office is now closer to 80-20. High rises are challenging. I'm not sure who you are hearing from with respect to high-rises, but it does not match with my experience.

JS: The townhome renderings are attractive. Seems to me we should talk about how much transit is available. A lot of density is being added, and we need to anticipate a lot of cars, and probably more than one. In terms of impacts, why put it on Governor? For support or not, we need numbers. Sounds like the legend for density used for the townhome slide is the same as the other areas.

KW: Yes.

JM: I can answer the height limit question in the life sciences. To add to LP's comment, it is true that the ability to handle hazardous materials drops precipitously as you go up, but for the industry in general, the ability to go higher is useful. For example, the Illumina project went from the more elegant, higher building to a lower squatter building, decreasing the permeable area. There are ways to work with higher lab buildings. The Grad Labs building on Campus Pointe at 5 stories is an example of one of the most successful buildings that Alexandria has constructed. What LP says is true, but we want to keep options open to go vertical in the industry.

Garrett Ashman: One unit on Governor stands out like a sore thumb. That person added two two-story residences in the backyard, and all it did was reduce the neighborhood land values by hundreds of thousands of dollars. You are asking to ruin our property for 30, 40 units. Was there a meeting on March 8? Please put the information on the website.

AW: This is the meeting designed to take feedback. We have asked for additional meetings for more extensive discussions.

Garrett Ashman: What was the meeting on March 8? Was it open?

AW: It was the UCPG meeting and is open to the public. Perhaps Chris Nielsen, UCPG Chair, can drop the agenda link into the chat. Please try to keep your comments to a minute.

GK: Grateful to the staff involved in the update, and I know there is pressure to produce housing from UCSD and others. Few know about the SUC zoning proposal. This would be a huge change in our area. Sprouts and Vons were the only areas discussed. There was nothing about new parks. The height limit varied, crowding out affordable housing. NUC is a better fit here or around Vons and Sprouts which have already been discussed. I support more discussion.

Jeff Dosick: The topic of mobility of Governor east of Genesee: We have a traffic study scheduled for west of Genesee. The problem with bike lanes is they get chopped up after installation and this drastically reduces the safety of bike riders where this occurs. From a cycling point of view, we need a cycle track. Is this being proposed?

KW: Yes, that is what is being proposed.

Ann Colins: I used to live in a UTC townhome. Moved to the west end in SUC since it became so urbanized in NUC. This is disheartening. It would increase density and traffic of a quiet neighborhood with small children. I'll want to see next month's parking proposal. Did not see the survey.

Shelly Plumb: I live on a street designated as townhome. On both sides there are single women in their 80s and close to 90. Lots of students, lots of cars. Probably they would like the townhomes. You think you'll live here forever. What is the timeline?

AW: Some of the timelines for plan completion were presented at the outset. Looking for approval by Council in Spring 2023. The plan does not do development but provides the rules for development.

Katie Dunahoo: I'm appalled by the map as it bleeds into the neighborhood. The city isn't respecting the neighborhood by forcing density. Are you required to present all this? It's hard to change later. What can we do now?

KW: It's an option for discussion, but just that. There is an option to not move forward with this. SB9 allows four units but not an increase in density allowed today in SUC.

Katherine Haskett: We voted for them. I'm surprised about the number of students who responded to the survey. With SB9 and rezoning, I look forward building six townhomes with no parking on my lot [comment is taken to be ironic]. Then, where would the parking be?

KW: Parking would be allowed.

AW: Without spaces provided on the lot, parking would be on the street.

Barbara Gelman: Who are the developers and investors and lobbyists who want to alter the community? Where is all the open space? Where are all the parks, etc.

Vijay Ganti: I have been a resident on Radcliffe for 5 years or so, and with this proposal we have a lot of students parking. Where do you want to accommodate the parking? We already have issues with the trolley. If high rises worked to bring housing costs down, we would not have Hong Kong or Manhattan as examples of high rental cost. Wondering about the rationale of it all.

Linda Beresford: This is an assault on the UC community. I understand the need for new housing, but the survey process that allowed students the same say as residents is flawed. To add more housing with and end-run around SB9 protection is wrong. The idea that residents will use transit is a fairy tale. I support the Vons and Sprouts changes but nothing more. We should reject any further development beyond these limits.

Ryan Scott: Over the years I have watched lovely areas be ravaged by development. I support areas outside the plan area like Convoy and Kearny Mesa for increased density. I would like to go on record that there is not a shortage of units in San Diego, but those suitable for families. The city should focus on neighborhoods and communities, not biotech billionaires and investors. The areas that have no housing should be explored before disturbing single family homes in quiet neighborhoods.

Charley Stephens: One take away is that SB9 allows one or two units at a time. This proposal is a big change as it takes big money to streamline townhome development. This changes the dynamic of the neighborhood in a larger way. The city needs to be honest about how this works and speeds things along with this proposal.

Tom Mullaney: The numbers presented are staggering. Except for downtown, I've not heard of a plan update with 2-3 times population increase. That's a question for staff? Did UC residents express a desire to have this increase?

AW: There was significant support reported on the online survey for a maximum housing option.

Andrew Parlier: Wrote this ahead of the meeting: Thanks to the team for the survey and increased representation by the survey. I'm excited to see the new growth in the plan. Make no mistake that we are growing. UCSD is adding students, Alexandria is building. Apple is entering the local area. The trolley will draw more people. UC should keep up with the times by up zoning its areas along the trolley. In 2021 San Diego passed San Francisco as the most unaffordable city in the US. The only way to keep the community growing and healthy is to embrace the growth already occurring. I'm happy to support a plan that embraces sustainability and growth.

AW: We have not discussed NUC. Should we add a meeting for more conversation? Could we schedule additional meetings to flesh out these details?

KW: We won't go through the second part of today's feedback discussion but will add a full presentation for next time.

AW: We appreciate the feedback to Planning.

Yolanda Housley: This is a rehash of earlier comments. I'm not looking forward to additional buildings going up. My home and lot are large because I live in this community. I see a lot more traffic resulting. I hope we can come to a place where we can all be content.

Bruce Driver: Did city planners calculate a demand number? Who is the responsible decision maker? Why do we need to meet employer demand in this area?

Susy Shamsky: The process isn't transparent. How can we obtain internal documents for everything? I find the whole process to be non-transparent. Why can't the east end of Governor be developed? Why can't we spread out SB9 development? Why would we want to concentrate the townhome lots?

David & Lois: You did not survey for proposed townhome growth. The average person does not monitor the city web site for information and does not know this is going on. This is a big change without notification.

AB: I'd like to speak out against the increased density in SUC. I support the increased density in the Sprouts and Vons centers. I want to speak about the community that the change of zoning will make. It will spark a cascade of unwanted events. More housing is desirable, but not in single family zones in SUC.

Robin Bettin: I live along Governor. I'm a public employee and I'm not impressed with the process. Nothing in the survey indicated the townhome proposal. You want to turn SUC into NUC. I can support Vons and Sprouts changes. Trading single family homes for townhomes, rentals and condos is not a good proposal. It will ruin the community.

Neil Hyytinen: I am a SUC resident. The city is not proposing anything that is not state law. Maybe it would be a good idea to have a subcommittee. Some plan updates are difficult, and the city has gone over the top in trying to make the process inclusive and transparent. Some of the charges aimed at the city are unfair. We are discussing this issue here. Get involved and make your views known.

LB: I'd like to echo AB's comments. The charm sells the area. I naively supported the trolley and the ability to move many residents from Clairemont, Balboa, and Downtown, all the way to Chula Vista for jobs in University. But not the addition of so many residents to University.

IK: It's not clear about the difference between the city plan and what SB9 allows, including protections under SB9. The city's vision for townhomes would reduce landscaping and trees. These promote better health. Is this change consistent with the tree canopy policy?

John Mattison: We moved here because of the qualities LB articulated. Did not choose to move into a high-density district with congestion and traffic.

Alastair Grey: UCSD student. A lot of the rhetoric is dehumanizing. Calling students transients is disgraceful. Students come and go, but students as a class stay. We can't have a situation where students need to drive an hour. We need the highest density housing close to campus. You profit when there is a housing shortage. It betrays a huge lack of empathy for students when you say, "I've got mine and we don't care about you". The University is growing and educates your children, too, and it's a good thing that it's growing. We need the community around the campus to be dense.

Nicholas Bock: I am a student. It's important to realize that this is an affordability crisis. We need more housing. If you care about housing and homelessness, supply matters. Any effort for density helps.

Michelle Kantor: I am a multi-generational resident. Thanks to all the voices who spoke, who opposed the changes. Affordable isn't \$3300/unit, either for students or residents. These changes are new, and the majority should ask for a resurvey on these proposals.

Sara Purkey: These proposals are not clearly communicated to the community. We need KW to speak to that. I'm in a lot that would be rezoned, and these residents should be communicated with. I am a UCSD professor. I'm not trying to say that students are bad, but I do want research to demonstrate that the change is addressing the issue. The city should do the research, so it does not become an Air B&B issue. This is a fire zone and I'd like this studied.

KW: I will mention that the UCCA newsletter is distributed to all SUC residents and is a source of information. Please be respectful with your comments.

LP: I empathize with SUC over changes to its neighborhoods. NUC has lots of condos, townhomes, etc., and these feel similarly impacted. I don't want the notion that all high density should be pushed to NUC. The NUC residents feel that their community has character, too.

DK: I strongly recommend three public forums at UC High. Just south UC. We need more interaction. One for SUC, two for NUC as there is so much there. I'd feel more confident in voting for options with more interaction.

AL: I'd like to thank staff, AW for moderating, and students who are doing finals, so kudos to all. I'm glad to hear new perspectives that are helpful. Students are not transients, so this is disheartening when community members call a group of the community "transients" and say they should have less of a say than other residents. They should be valued, too.

AW: I'd like to add my voice to AL. None are more or less important. Each is a voice. We have accomplished this together so far. I encourage the city to listen, and we will continue to work with KW and Planning to get more public input going. We need to get these details out and discuss them. We also need to get to NUC as there is an enormous amount to work through. I appreciate all the views. I want to apologize to Bill Beck, who did not get to comment. His neighborhood in NUC is also proposed to have a land change to multifamily, high density from single family. This will be brought up with the city.

8:31 PM Adjourned.