



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday May 17, 2022

Regular Time 6:00 PM

IN-PERSON MEETING AT UC HIGH SCHOOL

Part I 6:00PM to 7:00PM OPEN HOUSE OUTSIDE

PART II 7:00PM to 9:00PM REGULAR MEETING IN-PERSON IN THE THEATER

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), Debby Knight (DK), George Latimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Aidan Lin (AL), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Carol Uribe (CU), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Jason Morehead (JM), Laurie Phillips (LP)

Members not present:

Kris Kopensky (KK), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Petr Krysl (PK);

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

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

City Staff:

Nancy Graham (NG) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department

Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department

Martin Flores (MF) – Sr. Planner, Department of Parks and Recreation

Tait Galloway (TG) – Assistant Director, Planning Department

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein (BB)

Nancy Groves (NGroves)

Diane Ahern (DA)

Kaitlyn Willoughby (KWI)

Isabelle Kay (IK)

Andrew Barton (AB)

Neil Hyytinen	(NH)
Jeff Dosick	(JD)
Public member	(Public)

7:02 Call to Order – Chair Andy Wiese

7:03 Roll Call – Chair Andy Wiese

See list of members present and absent above.
Thirteen members present.

7:07 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 15, 2022, and March 15, 2022

Minutes for February 15: No corrections. Motion to approve by KR, GL 2nd. Approved by acclamation.

Minutes for March 15: No corrections. Motion to approve by KJ, DiM 2nd. Approved by acclamation.

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

[approx. 250 participants at the indoor meeting.]

7:08 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Public: Are bike lanes included in the plan update.

A: Yes.

Public: Have environmental studies been done?

AW: Yes, an EIR will begin soon after Land Use Scenarios (LUS) are complete, with completion date uncertain. EIRs take months to complete.

Public: There is not enough infrastructure in the community. We are paying a lot for water and electric. The trolley should be a train, Governor Dr. should have transit.

Public: Will there be an EIR to study?

A: The city says yes. It will be available when complete.

Councilmember Joe LaCava: I have waited a long time to see everyone. How many have never been to a plan update meeting? [Many hands up.] I'd like to thank city staff inside and outside

this room. Spoiler: the city has removed the townhome zoning proposal from south UC. This was clearly a distraction to the plan update process. Andy Wiese was working very hard on decisions for the long haul. Tonight, there will be a good discussion about parks and urban spaces. There will be enhancements which is the purpose of the plan. Please stay around in the weeks that follow as we still want to hear from you. You will leave D1 for D6 in December, but the council office will still be here. It is good to see everyone in person. Thanks to Andy for the time to speak.

Public: For Joe La Cava. Will the townhome proposal come back?

JLC: No, not in this plan update.

7:08 AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT FOR OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK

Linda Beresford on behalf of Save UC gives a presentation on the townhome policy. Slide numbers are in [].

- [1] Summary of the issue.
- [2] Save UC petition: We have concerns on plan update.
- [3] The survey provided flawed data, and the conclusions drawn were faulty as well.
- [4] City significantly overestimates future housing needs.
- [5] City's jobs/housing ratio is misapplied.
- [6] South UC is not a TPA.
- [7] Where will children play?
- [8] City must rethink the approach to Land Use Scenarios (LUS).

Hou Yu-Je (UC San Diego student): I want to find a place to do research. I need a \$120K/year salary to fund a \$3K/month apt. We are at a point where San Diego is one of the least affordable cities in the US. NY or SF rent is cheaper. So, I'm sorry I'm one of the people that Joe LaCava wants to stay. I can't thank the city enough for the super loop.

Katie Rodolico read a letter from Bill Beck concerning the Vista La Jolla development:

"Hi - I was asked to read a message from William Beck, board president of the Vista La Jolla Homeowners' association.

The HOA is comprised of 56 single family detached homes are the only ones like it in North UC. It is located in one of the identified "Super Blocks". This super block has a variety of housing: mid-range and high-end rentals, townhomes, and our single-family homes. Seritage is rumored to be looking into building a high rise of more homes. There is already a good mix of density and diversity.

The 56 single family homes off Town Centre Drive are currently at a density of 5-10 dwelling units per acre. The latest city proposal would increase the density to 15-29 dwelling units per acre.

We would like to be treated the same as south UC and retain our single-family zoning. Therefore, I respectfully request that the 56 Vista La Jolla homes continue to be regarded as single family residential as per the current community plan.

William Beck”

T Mull: Livable SD: UC’s issues are part of a similar, forced up zoning in Hillcrest. There are about 170K sites that can handle housing (RHNA estimate). Up zoning is not necessary considering declining population. The last plan was the best. The strong mayor does not mean he can dictate. I would ask that the salesmanship stops.

La Jolla Village HOA member: The survey was not distributed in our area. The neighbors were not aware of it. A third LUS was redacted at some point. Why was this decision made? Why not consider the 30’ height limit? It’s an error to increase density without infrastructure. How do we provide police and fire? Thanks to all.

Alastair Erg: UC San Diego student: There are a lot of us. Things change after 20 years. 4 figures/month on rent. All the proposed scenarios are inadequate to address our needs. It is a fantasy to assume that UTC / etc. will build is ridiculous. Both north and south UC need to provide more housing. More housing, please!

Rahm: (UC San Diego student): We need more density throughout. Housing is expensive for all, not just for students, but also TA’s, faculty, and staff. Housing builds are all too low to support the long-term residents. I’m proposing greater options, mixed use along with the density. Mobility options as well.

Jessie O’Sullivan: (Circulate San Diego): We are in a housing crisis. House prices rose 20%. Entering our careers but won’t be able to afford housing. We need more housing. UC San Diego just received the largest grant in its history: people will need a place to live. Many community members are not present, but I encourage the most density possible.

Riannnan Callahan: I’m a UC resident from birth and a student. I support the highest density housing. Think about the housing you have and extrapolate to younger people. I’d ask that people [remainder of the comment not recorded].

Sparky: UC San Diego student: To live here we need the highest density. These highest density options will ensure that this housing exists. I urge you to adopt the highest density options and respect all opinions today.

Andrea: I’ve lived for 10 years in north UC and now live in south UC. Increasing density in south UC will not affect affordability. There are other areas around the city. We need upgraded libraries in both north and south UC.

Unknown Speaker: We agree with Tom Mullaney and think that UC has been targeted. Our Community Plan was done in 1987. Fifteen other communities have older plans. I lived in

north UC. The city has proposed a vast number of housing units. We believe we have done our fair share. These proposals are as if we are the only ones doing a plan update.

Richard Carson: I would like to address the concerns of our UCSD student friends. There is a much better solution here. What did UCLA do about a year ago? UCLA built housing for undergrads. They provide a 100% housing guarantee. This pulls the students back onto campus from the community. UCLA does not need to recoup the land costs. There is a state legislative bill that would increase funding for this kind of housing. The financing cost is lower. Campuses can help.

Adrian Bustos: I'd like to address fellow students. I lived in UC 20 years ago. Density won't do it alone. A train, not a trolley, is needed. Improving UC does not involve higher density. We need infrastructure and water. Biotech companies serve the entire county, not just UC.

Rolf: Homeowner in south UC. The issue is that housing pressure from UCSD which will be subsidized by the State and [need more].

Bill Batista: Seems an "us vs. them" with students. When I graduated, I had to move elsewhere and eventually came back. When you build more housing here, it doesn't just serve local residents. It's a world-wide market.

Lisa: Housing that is built is not affordable; this is a developer scenario. I have rented for a long time. New housing won't be affordable.

Member of public: I had a meeting with Joe LaCava. What makes him think that the housing will be affordable? [He played a recording from JLC which was not recorded].

AL: Nice to be here in person. Context about feelings is running high. On-campus housing is good but many community members fight on-campus housing. This is not us vs. them, we're all part of the community.

MC: (for herself, not BIOCOM): I live in Clairmont in a single-family home. I wish I lived in south UC surrounded by students. I want students to be able to live in San Diego. [Additional personal comments not recorded.]

Agenda item "Overview of Future Public Space Opportunities".

NG: I took over the project two months ago. I have 8 years in the Planning Department. It takes awhile to get up to speed. The survey was never meant to be a statistical survey: not the only method of sampling community opinion but a way for those who cannot attend to add their voice. Surveys are very difficult to do. We'll try to deliver.

The way we do planning is to consider a “reasonably foreseeable future”. In other plan areas only a fraction of the properties will redevelop. So, when we put together alternate land use plans, we take this into account. The idea that changing the land use scenario causes change is possible, but very unlikely. We are doing our best to put proposals together, some to like, some not. We need to open up “many” to get “some”. An assessment of the infrastructure needs is part of the process.

NG: I will explain the Parks Master Plan (PMP) concepts. There is lots of interest in how facilities financing would work. Martin Flores is here as well to answer questions.

[Values in brackets refer to presentation PDF page numbers.]

- [1, 2] Presentation introduction.
- [3] Map of parks and open space in University.
- [4] 2018 surveyed community about amenities.
- [5] In 2019, had more outreach with similar results.
- [6] A summary of what we’ve heard during the current plan update.

PMP Overview

- [8] PMP adopted in summer 2021. The details are online.
- [9] What is it? Why was it updated? The previous plan was adopted in 1957.
- [10] Standards and goals under the PMP: point system, distance of parks from users.
- [11] The important appendix is “D”, the scoring matrix for park amenities.
- [12] Park typologies: trailhead pocket parks, linear parks.
- [13] Mini-park – existing. Scoring example.
- [14] Mini-park – proposed. Scoring example.
New parks need to be approved under Council Policy 400-33.
- [15] Parks standard, including Rec center and aquatic complex.
- [16] Topic: existing community and neighborhood parks.
- [17] Future parks, including current parks.

- [18] Urban placemaking, including more community amenities.
- [19] Future parks assessment for University.
- [20] Topic: North University Parks and Public Spaces Opportunities.
- [21] Urban Placemaking.
- [22] Better guidance under the plan.
- [23] Topic: Integrated connections.
- [24] Executive Dr. promenade.
- [25] Urban Greening examples.
- [26] Formalizing “informal” spaces, including private property.
- [27] Integrate recreational assets with housing.
- [28] Creative use of space. More urban spaces with higher density.
- [29] BMP and Stormwater conveyance.
- [30] Eastgate mini-park, adjacent to a stormwater facility.
- [31] Regents Rd. north stub, using the right of way.
- [32] Topic: South University public space opportunities.
- [33] Regent’s overlook south.
- [34] Governor linear parks.
- [35] Governor linear park.
- [36] Nature play opportunities.
- [37] Open space overlooks.
- [38] Standley Community Park.
- [39] University Village neighborhood park.

[40] Opportunities to add more recreation points to the community: discussion.

NG: Improving parks is on the table, so this is part of the process.

AW: We will take comments from the subcommittee first.

KR: Is the linear parks issue still there for transportation and stormwater? (Will these be managed by Parks and Rec or Transportation and Stormwater?)

NG: There are limitations with TSW management but still opportunities.

DK: The PMP is complicated and new. University is the first community to use the PMP with the plan. We need to figure out how this gets implemented. We need some idea of how developers would approach parks. In-lieu fees don't stay with the community. This is much more complex than the old population standard. We need to see what we get, where the money goes.

AW: How would the park standard be applied in the new plan?

MF: It is based on development population; this number needs to be estimated from the proposed land use scenarios. We will go through a public process (CP 400-33) to create and/or modify parks.

AW: Are in-lieu fees possible?

MF: Yes, developers can pay a fee rather than build a park on site.

VA: Whose interest will be looked after?

MF: On an acreage basis, we were insufficient before. We are looking for park space, looking to developers to make this work.

Tom Hekman: I ran the aquatic program at Standley in the old days. I'd like to thank MF for the aquatic pool recently built there. [There follows an exchange between TH and MC regarding her comments earlier, with TH objecting to their basis, MC reiterating them.]

Member of the Public: I could not afford to live here when I first moved to the area. I do believe that land use scenarios *would* create change on their own, and these would impact the community.

NG: SB9 has already happened, with changes in the number of units/single family lots.

Member of the Public: The city could acquire La Jolla Colony Park; this would help increase the amount of park space in the community.

Member of the Public: Gave a history of her experience over time in the community. It was a tough time to make it.

Member of the Public: Lost some respect after some comments made earlier. Not sure about Nancy Graham's comments about the survey: one thing was surveyed, density. What about other things? What is the data based on? What opportunities are there in other communities for housing? Don't forget all the housing built since the 1987 plan.

Barbara Gelman: The Regents Road Bridge south overlook park proposed could be a homeless center. We will be fighting developers for space for parks. Safety: where have you discussed public safety with the PD and FD? They struggle with staffing and won't be able to service the increases in people.

Bob Treiter: I appreciate the survey, but only a small number knew about the survey. What about the Vons and Sprouts commercial areas? What contribution is Alexandria expected to make? (Costa Verde project?) Will there be housing on their redevelopment?

AW: Adjourned at 9PM.