



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday June 21, 2022

Regular Time 6:00 PM

MEETING BY ZOOM

DRAFT

6:07 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), Jason Morehead (JM), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW)

Members not present:

Kris Kopensky (KK), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Carol Uribe (CU), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Laurie Phillips (LP)

ROLL CALL TO BE VERIFIED BY AW/NG

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

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)

6:07 Call to Order – Chair Andy Wiese

6:09 Roll Call – Chair Andy Wiese

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

6:11 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 15, 2022, and March 15, 2022

Minutes for April 19: No corrections. Approved by acclamation.

Minutes for May 17: No corrections. Approved by acclamation.

Note: Resend the draft minutes to NG/SL for April 19 with Veronica Ayesta attending, change made by CN on 6/21.

Note: Resend the draft minutes to NG/SL for May 17 with Veronica Ayesta attending, change made by CN on 6/21.

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

[102 participants at the meeting.]

6:13 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Public: Are bike lanes included in the plan update.

A: Yes.

Linda Beresford: Can the Planning Department provide a timeline for completion of public meetings and submission of the plan to the subcommittee for a vote, and when the draft EIR will be ready? Can the Planning Department supply or share how it will use data to achieve its desired housing goals? Please share the metrics used. Does the Planning Department plan to revise the scenarios based on community feedback and how the iterative process will be incorporated? Please advise how the community can move forward on the two commercial areas in south UC, including parking for new residents?

Diane Ahern: statement by email.

Susy Shamsky: UC resident. On March 8, I submitted a Public Records Request on the land use scenarios, requesting documents, emails, and work product. The city identified several departments involved including the Planning Department and Mayor's office, and I received some documents but not from the Planning Department or Mayor's office. The city has a legal obligation to produce these documents. This failure shows a lack of transparency. These

records must be produced immediately.

David Broide: 1. The UCSD Chancellor's announcement on student housing, increasing on-campus beds from 20,000 to 40,000 on campus. How will this be incorporated into plans? 2. We frequently ask questions on land use but don't get responses at meetings, so it would be good if there were a register of responses. For example, Sprouts: two stories high from Katie Witherspoon, five stories high from Nancy Groves. How can we get these answers? How will they be publicly displayed?

JS: I am concerned: the survey is done and the city made a proposal several months ago on land use scenarios by Katie Witherspoon. This resulted in an uproar. We have never discussed in depth the city proposal with respect to south UC's commercial areas. The city is still providing us with a plan maximizing density. I don't understand or agree with what we are doing with respect to incentives and don't know if we need to take the plan in another direction.

Jen Dunaway: Linda from Save UC outlined significant flaws in the plan. The plan should be redone, surveys, feedback, and so forth. Proceeding on like it did not happen is not an option. There are older communities that are older than ours. There were many plan amendments. Focus the density somewhere else. RHNA numbers were not used to generate the input to the plan update. What about other areas, and how is equity achieved?

Jemma Samala: A reminder that a big event is at Standley Park on July 4. Information is in the UCCA newsletter and at uccelebration.com.

DK: When we started the community plan update process, the city stated that it was collaborative, but the city presented us with two massive two massive scenarios. The city wants one or the other approved. There has been no opportunity to discuss or modify these proposals. I call on the city to engage collaboratively with the public to make changes to both proposals.

Tom Mullaney: Public Facilities: We all know that the Planning Department wants to force 10-20K new residences without reference to public facilities. Land Use and Housing will hear Build Better San Diego, a new policy with community generated funds (impact fees) going to the city, with no provision that the DIF would come back to your community. Your area's infrastructure needs and commercial development impacts won't be addressed.

Bonnie Kutch: The Vons and Sprouts shipping centers should be discussed as an iterative process limiting the amount of increase in residents and making sure there is adequate parking in the shopping centers with infrastructure to support this growth. Make sure parking is addressed in a self-contained matter. Place two story height limit on the shopping centers and conduct a traffic impact study for the proposed development.

Jennifer Morton-Roff: I've come away disappointed that proposals for our neighborhood were not addressed. I would like more detail on the shopping center sites and would like to be sure

that retail, especially grocery stores, is preserved. We cannot be expected to provide responses to these proposals without details and must assume the worst.

RRW: Thanks for the new pool facility in south UC and the tennis facility in north UC. On p58 of the existing conditions in the community atlas shows 1609 acres of beautiful parks in the community, including 1000+ acres of park land that was not included in the atlas. 41.44 acres per thousand.

Pablo Valera: Input from the community was not included. I suggest the city solicit feedback from community that better reflects community desires and incorporates this into the plan. This is the only way to promote responsive growth and provide an iterative discussion of the plan. This is the only way a plan can be created that the community can support.

Garrett Ashman: I'd like to push back on any proposal the city makes that is not supported by metrics, especially for density and jobs, including location. How many jobs are being proposed and by whom? There are unanswered questions on student housing costs and student enrollment projections. How much is enrollment growth is expected and why and how much?

Barry Bernstein: I'd like to acknowledge the comments made. I'd also like to congratulate Mack and Merle Langston on restarting the UC Garden Club. A long overdue traffic light project on Governor and Lakeside. The banner district proposal. And the 4th of July celebration.

AW: I would ask if there were any members of the subcommittee who would like to participate in the UC Celebration on July 4 and speak to the proposals?

KR: I can do an hour or two.

DiM: I can do some time as well.

KJ: I can be a part of it.

AW: Nancy, would you like to respond to any of the public comments?

NG: Some comments might be answered by the presentation, so I should proceed with that. I'm new to the project with just three meetings, so I'm getting up to speed. I will review the community benefits strategy for University using the plans from Kearney Mesa and Downtown. We don't have to follow these strategies; this may produce a more nuanced land use plan. I will take feedback for the updated plan. Next month I expect to provide updated Land Use plans.

Presentation from June 2022 on planuniversity.org/meetings "Presentation PDF". PDF/slide numbers are given in [...].

[5] Incentive Zoning. The base density in a zone is development by right with density bonus granted by incentives. We will review the downtown plan and see how these incentives work.

[6] Understanding FAR (Floor Area Ratio). Used as a controlling metric for how large buildings are. Ratio of floor area of the building to the lot size.

[7] How incentive bonuses work in Downtown, from 2006.

[8] Land Use and FAR bonus maps for Downtown.

[9] Bonuses for Urban Public Spaces. Provides a bonus of 1 or 2 in FAR. These spaces must be open from 7am to 9pm, display public welcoming signs, and be privately maintained.

[10] Three-bedroom units can provide a bonus from 0.5 to 2.0 FAR.

[11] An eco-roof can provide a maximum of 0.5 FAR bonus.

[12] Specific Use Bonus FARs are largely found in Downtown. It's hard to require a grocery store but we could allow extra density in exchange for a grocery store.

[13] Mobility infrastructure. Parking was an incentive for the PETCO area. There are incentives for providing below-grade parking.

[14] FAR bonus payment. Payment can be used to obtain a FAR bonus. The funds may only be used in Downtown. This neighborhood enhancement program money stays in the community (even under new DIF rules).

[15] Sustainable buildings get FAR bonuses of 1.0 or 2.0, based on LEED ratings and CALGreen tiers.

[16] Greenways can obtain up to a 2.0 FAR, based on a list of amenities.

[17] Parks in the Kearney Mesa Plan. These park uses are the kinds of things the city can administer, with regulations listed in the presentation slide.

[18] Affordable housing incentives. This is not very applicable, but perhaps you can suggest some more appropriate incentives.

VA: Many questions, and I will try to break them down. It is interesting to see how the city can use downtown to compare with UC. Not really in common. Looking at p27 of the downtown plan and it is hard to see how the downtown plan is applicable to UC. Talked about dilapidated buildings. What is the purpose for the breakout rooms and what is expected. What are the incentives concepts in detail, and who receives them?

NG: We don't have to do incentives like this. The idea is not to achieve the downtown incentives but this area is the only example in the city that uses incentives like this. I only brought this forward since we get comments that we don't get anything in exchange for density, and

this shows how bonuses are used. For breakout group discussion. You talk about each idea presented and is it appropriate for UC. You may add caveats to it for clarity and applicability.

JS: I don't have an a clear understanding of FAR or density, so you are asking for what's important for us to get in exchange for density and can we make use of this. Can we come up with tradeoffs?

NG: I want to see if there are areas in the community where you would accept more density and what you'd expect in exchange for it. I could come back with an adjusted land use plan based on this feedback.

JS: It would take forever to complete a list for each area.

NG: Only the big picture, like, no bonus program in south UC, for instance. Or you can say no eco roofs anywhere. You don't need to tie it to specific streets, but you can if you want. The idea is to determine if you even want this kind of plan.

JS: I see a lot of negative comments in the chat, but I see this as an area we could work with as long as we understand we don't have an agreement on the base density at this stage.

NG: I would adjust the land use scenario densities down to reflect that the scenario land uses could be achieved with incentives.

JS: I think I understand where we are going now, thanks.

AW: I think you are saying this is a separate conversation where we say what areas are possible for extra density based on incentives, and you use this information to revise the land use scenarios appropriately in your next pass at the LUS.

NG: Yes. If you look at how the downtown plan works, there is what you can do by right but where you can add density by incentive. For example, base FAR might be 10, but there is a list of incentives that makes another 10. Much more nuanced. Some areas in UC might work this way.

AW: What do you envision as the next step for subcommittee meetings and agenda?

NG: If people hate it, we'll go back to the previous LUS, look for the comments we've received, and revise. If people like it, I'll come back with a Land Use Scenario with bonus program. I'd look at which incentives you like, and which you don't. I'm trying to work with you to find a way forward based on the feedback received. It works pretty well in downtown, so there might be a place for that in UC.

Paul Goldstein: It's a trade-off: it is premature to propose tradeoffs without knowing what the base range is. For example, what is the base FAR range for north UC? This seems premature.

NG: The existing mixed use base zones are 3, 5, and 7 FAR, the densities and could go to 10. We would roll them back and achieve the result with an incentive program. Just try to get a sense of what might be possible. Use the strategy to massage the plan that is there.

Paul Goldstein: They are not ready to be massaged because we don't know what they are. It's an order of operation issue. We need metrics to determine the amount of growth that is justified by the data. Then we can talk about incentives for density.

NG: The LUS have been out for a while. We have the north UC LUS. This could be a way to have a bigger conversation as we have not yet discussed them in detail. Is there a better relationship between density and incentives? Is this worth discussion?

KR: People make the point that it's hard to talk about incentives based on the May 12 LUS. There will still be some push back since this is an "order of operation" issue. The other thing is that we've had a lot of talk about green spaces, ramblas, and so forth, but we only get that if we agree to a lot of density. It sounds like we need to allow a lot more density to get back what we thought we were getting in 2020. This does not sound like the basis for agreement.

NG: I'm looking for a third LUS that is rolled back from May 12, then add back some density based on incentives. I'm hearing you don't like options 1 and 2, so am looking at a way to get an alternate.

KR: Would you start with less than May 12, or the current LUS?

NG: I heard DK state that one of the developers has a soccer field but it's not public. This is an example of where you could have had a bonus density program by exchange. But you might not want this throughout the community. Meeting after meeting I've heard that we don't get anything in exchange for density, but the city only has incentives to obtain these amenities. We have much more success with the carrot than the stick. This should be a positive, but we don't need to do this.

AW: What is your expectation for what people will do in the breakout rooms? This is next on the agenda. What is our goal?

NG: The subcommittee members have their sheets with the table of types of incentive, is it appropriate, and any applicability comments. Each breakout room will report back, and I'd like those comment sheets back within a week.

AW: How would you like us to organize our time from here?

NG: We have an hour left, then need the reports.

AW: We'll take a comment from Linda Beresford and Debby Knight.

Linda Beresford: We are kind of talking past each other, and I feel uncomfortable about giving something more without an agreement on the base case. I would suggest that the community starts there.

DK: I would discuss this but the developers are getting massive land value increase. I would suggest that we discuss it from this basis. As Tom Mullaney pointed out, this increase might occur without the increase in benefit from the DIF fees paid by developers, if this makes sense.

AW: Yes, this makes sense.

NG: I only want questions. These are comments.

AW: We should go to the breakout rooms and get feedback. This is a going to basics conversation: here are some options, and here are others. What are your opinions about these different density bonuses? Or your group could decide we don't want any density bonus.

SL: We will now move into break out rooms. Each member of the subcommittee will be paired with some members of the public to discuss land use incentives. When you are called back from the rooms, each group will be expected to give a short report on what was discussed.

[Break out rooms initiated.]

SL: Questions or comments from each breakout room.

Room 1: AW: This was the beginning of a useful discussion and could benefit from extra time. There were 6 or 7 present and a variety of important comments reflective of the public comment so far. Many people don't feel that the growth proposed so far has been justified. Our group expressed specific concerns about grocery stores and other community serving retail. One comment that came out of consensus in our group was that community serving retail continue to exist by regulation (zoning) or by bonus incentives to provide this function. There should be incentives to create the 'Rambla' greenway (Exec Drive) and other "green" incentives or park-like facilities in private developments. We should discuss whether they stay under public or private ownership, or a combination of both.

Room 2: KR: Seven people as well. Proposed land use is a moving target. We started with incentives but decided that many of these things should just be part of the plan. Parks and Rec incentives might be used, but multiple developers are difficult to manage. Bridge is an example of something in the plan, with funds paid, but not built. There is skepticism about community funds; this needs to be part of the plan. Don't let developers buy FAR or buy out

affordable housing. They should be required to build affordable housing locally. There was a lot of interest about mobility, wider sidewalks, for example, and not as part of an incentive.

AW: A similar sentiment was expressed by Group 1.

Room 3: DiM: Overall caveat that this discussion is too early since we do not have a base agreement on a base density scenario. Eco roofs, not so much as this is a global benefit, We discussed planning in general. Tom Mullaney made comments about communities hiring their own planners and coming up with our own plan. General concern about why the density proposed is so high here, rather than spreading it out to larger areas of the city. Tried to discuss how it works here. Concern about south UC commercial and parking. Why not put things in as part of the zoning or overlay zone?

Room 4: JM: Our group expressed frustration about not being listened to and not receiving answers outside the meeting, cited students as the problem, with UCSD the problem: doing too little, too late. From an Alexandria point of view the issue revolves around sustainability: supports incentives for parking, LEED, and progressive Transit Demand Management options. There are not enough incentives for TDMs. Onsite amenities reduce VMT and should be incentivized.

Room 5: CN: Our group had many comments like the other groups. Pay more attention to supermarkets in the area is a huge concern, particularly in south UC where the definition of mixed use is a concern with potential for pushing out supermarkets. Our expectations were that these incentives will mostly apply to north UC. SANDAG's data is an issue, and a general distrust of the process. Parking is a big concern. NG wants this information so we should give it, and there is a need for transportation studies along Governor. Top four recommendations for potential incentives are: three-bedroom units, mobility infrastructure, FAR, and affordable housing.

Room 6: DK: Group expressed concerns about loss of light, traffic, worry that south UC would push all of the increased density into north UC, which would suffer most in this scenario. One positive impact is that the developer fees would stay in the community depending on how the fees were structured. Group made comments on incentives for housing: type of housing for tech workers that is affordable, middle income, and workforce housing. Loss of retail and grocery stores. The height limit west of I-5 is a concern.

Room 7: RC: Shock over the high-density figures and lack of alternatives. Comments on basic needs, the cart seems to be before the horse. Many concerns with housing, replacement housing. Look at some of the lowest density, lowest cost housing. Developers destroy low-income housing and replace with higher income housing. We need better than 10% inclusionary. Some of the lowest income people live to the southwest of Nobel and Genesee. There needs to be a balance in the future plan so that all income levels are represented.

Room 8: AL, not on call, Elizabeth Manion substituting. No subcommittee members in our group. Why are we starting here instead of going back to the beginning? For the carrot and stick, we're left with the stick.

Room 9: VA: Many comments in common with others. Comments about the process being backwards, baseline not clear. Discussion of proposals re: Vons and Sprouts, the area is near two schools, including traffic increases. Parking amount per unit should be developed as part of the plan. Keep the commercial areas no more than two stories and keep supermarkets. Two story maximum, please. Many older residents rely on the market by walking.

Room 10: JS: Vote in the group 6-1 to not provide incentives: we don't want to bid against ourselves. Want to debate the density base first. Incentives OK, but want the information first. We've been working off the city proposal but want to start with community proposal. People want to look at a community alternative. I would hope the planning department would work with us to come up with options.

Room 11: RRW: One person said they rejected the scenarios. Want increased metrics, stay on topic, only 5 or 6 or so areas considered. Concerns expressed over loss of grocery stores, inaccessibility of parking lots due to student parking, size of the student population, concerns that UCSD students were going to be housed on-campus along trolley. A bonus density program would need to improve from the list provided. Support Linear parks. No cash payments in lieu of affordable housing.

Room 12: KJ: Rehash of the south UC plan to add density that was poorly done. SB9 requirements versus what the city proposed. Would the plan create eminent domain issues? There was a lack of complete understanding of the process. Group discussed UC San Diego plan to add density and the trolley on-campus. Would adding more density help or hurt along the trolley? The assumption is that it was designed to add more trips in and back. The community does not support density without a base discussion. We lost traction on options. Grocery stores should stay, greenways are important in any scenario.

Room 13: GL: No new ground not already discussed. People want a better understanding for what the basis for growth is. They want to understand the reasons for density and the impacts of growth. Incentives could be appropriate along with urban public spaces but we need to understand the base situation.

SL: Those concludes the reports.

AW: Nancy, are you satisfied with these responses?

NG: I appreciate your time. You have much more history with the project than I do. There is a clear message that what was on the table isn't the community desire. We need to get to a better place. I realize the city lost credibility with the south UC proposal, so we have to get back on track. There is a reality that the city is changing and will grow, and we need to find a

way to grow. We will start to work on a new LUS based on what we've heard in the last two meetings. I appreciate your time.

AW: There has been a loss of trust and credibility. It would be invaluable to ask your team to assign more resources to answering some of the community's questions. This would help people understand the city's intentions. You can take feedback on "more" or "less", but many of the questions are on procedure, and it would be valuable to answer them. We are a community of skilled, professional, well-educated people, lots of scientists and engineers, so if you can answer them, I think this will help. I hope you include feedback from the February LUS that I provided in March.

Let's continue to do better than we have as we move forward.

KR: I plan my vacations about a year out, so I'd like to know what the schedule will be.

NG: Displayed slide [21]. July: Incentives and LUS strategy. August no meeting but there will be a Planning Commission workshop on the third Thursday of August. Fall: I hope to release a first draft of the plan released.

Linda Bernstein: Can someone save the chat?

NG: We will save the chat and will post on-line after modest editing for inappropriateness.

8:43 Meeting adjourned.