UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – Tuesday October 18, 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), Jason Morehead (JM), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Roger Cavnaugh (RC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Petr Krysl (PK), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Dinesh Martien (DiM)

Members not present:
Kris Kopensky (KK), Carol Uribe (CU), Kristen Camper (KC)

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)
Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Andrew Barton	(AB)
Neil Hyytinen	(NH)
Jeff Dosick	(JD)
Public member	(Public)

6:03   Call to Order – Chair Andy Wiese

6:04   Roll Call – Chair Andy Wiese

      See list of members present and absent above.
      Thirteen members present at start of meeting, sixteen members later.

      Approximately 116 people on the zoom call, with a high of 132 people during the meeting.

6:09   APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 21, 2022, and September 20, 2022

June 21, 2022, minutes approved by acclamation.

September 20, 2022, minutes approved by acclamation.

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

6:14   NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Haoyu Jia: Resident of south UC, staff member at UCSD Health. I have a general comment regarding friends and co-workers who have to share a bedroom. I have friends who are functionally homeless since they cannot afford to live in the area. I know that there are a lot of people in south UC who are very hostile to UCSD students, but on behalf of people that work at UC San Diego and UC San Diego Health, we hope the city is able to provide necessary infrastructure and foresight which would allow people to live and work in the area.

Madison Coleman (Climate Action Campaign): I would like to insure that people who are not on the subcommittee but are members of the public will be able to comment.

AW: Yes. That is our goal and the reason we want to focus on the Land Use Scenarios (LUS).

Karen Arden: I would like to know what data the city used to create the Land Use Scenarios.

AW: NG will speak directly to that during her presentation.

David Wright: [15:00 into the recording. Comment largely garbled with background noise.] Comment regarding the comment on UCSD and tech from the UCSD Health staff member who just spoke. Comment on the accuracy of the minutes.

AW: The minutes reflects my understanding of what the recording shows but I would entertain an email on a specific correction to the minutes.

Paul Goldstein: My comments are mostly historical, since hostility was raised as a subject. The University City community was founded at the same time as UC San Diego to combat the racism and antisemitism found in the existing community. The city did something right, building two vibrant communities, north and south UC. University City has housed and historically always housed the people who make this industry work. It is an historical malfeasance to ignore these people and ignore the continuing attraction that places like this provide.

Suzi Shamsky: I live in University City. The city of San Diego prides itself on transparency and states this on its web site. Not so. This is not my experience: I submitted a Public Records Access request in March 18 regarding the plan update but haven't received material after seven months of waiting. The mayor's office and planning department were identified has holding these records. After seven months, I have received no records of substance from Planning and none from the mayor's office. The community has a right to see these records.

Jen Dunaway: I agree with Suzi. You all have received hundreds of comments and questions since the April and May meetings. I received a four-page Q&A document from NG that skirts the issues. The questions are framed to fit the answers; this does not cut it for public meetings: she must answer the questions asked. Especially since the issues are controversial. I heard a lot of comments at the Planning Commission workshop from students and even a planning commissioner that non-student residents were hostile towards students. I feel the opposite: as a non-student, the students, business members, and labor council leaders are all hostile towards non-student residents.

AW: We'll proceed with Nancy Graham's presentation on the discussion of Land Use Scenarios.

6:24   Land Use Scenario Discussion – NG.

Reference: "October 2022 – Land Use Scenarios Presentation PDF" on planuniversity.org/meetings. PDF page / slide numbers are given in […] below. In the same location a copy of the recording and zoom chat may be found.

[Staff will be using a Google tool called "Jam Board" to record comments.]

NG: [Gives presentation for tonight's meeting.]

[4]   Possible Scenarios. The city anticipates moving forward with more than one land use scenario.
          We have a staff recommendation scenario ("Scenario 2"). We are open to a "CPG" scenario based on the comments we receive tonight. It will be possible to add an additional scenario at a future meeting; this scenario does not need to start with Scenario 2.

[5]   SANDAG Population Growth Forecast. We have received many questions and comments on this subject. The SANDAG forecasts are:

- Constrained by the adopted Community Plan
- Not intended to be a target for Community Plan Updates
- As Plan Updates occur, the Forecast is re-adjusted to accommodate changes
- Forecast is updated every 4 years

[6]   SANDAG Forecasts over time:

Housing Units Needed in San Diego in 2030
- Series 10 –558,100   2004
- Series 11 –574,254
- Series 12 –629,694
- Series 13 –613,493
- Series 14 –622,795   2021
  Using the earliest forecast to project housing needs will produce fewer units than needed by ~64K units.

[7]   Downtown Forecast:

Housing Units Forecast for 2030
- Series 10 –34,282
- Series 11 –49,453
- Series 12 –44,257
- Series 13 –36,651
- Series 14 –47,212

A plan update occurred between Series 10 and Series 11. Since the forecast uses the plan update as an input, the Series 11 produced close to the 53,100 units identified in the plan update. It looks at the plan capacity and then projects growth based on that capacity. Even now it does not show reaching build-out capacity in 2030.

[8]   Kearney Mesa Forecast

A similar effect is seen between Series 13 and Series 14 which has the series 14 with close to the number of units in the plan-updated buildout: the projection doubled after the plan update. It still projects less than full build-out in the updated community plan.

[9]   University Community Forecast

This series of forecasts remains relatively constant from Series 10 to Series 14 due to no change in the community plan. All SANDAG has done is anticipate minor plan amendments for its forecast. It does not take into account a potential plan update.

All SANDAG does is incorporate the current community plans into the housing forecast numbers. For this reason, the planning department does not use the SANDAG forecast for its plan update housing needs assessment. If we adopt the current SANDAG targets, we'd get the projections in the current plan, not an updated one.

[10]   SANDAG Series 14 Forecast excerpt for University. Only minor changes in the forecast.

[11]   SANDAG Series 13 Forecast excerpt for University. Only minor changes in the forecast.

[12]   Plan Update schedule (18 done, 5 in progress, 4 updates in next cycle).

This answers why we can't use the current SANDAG forecasts and that University is not the first to be updated.

Andy Wiese will lead the discussion with subcommittee and public comments captured using "Jam Board" operated by Suchi Lukes. We'll add notes to the Jam Board maps as people talk. Please let us know of any errors and we will alter the annotation.

[Recording time point: 32:55]

AW: The idea here is to collect feedback on proposed Land Use Scenario 2 (LUS2). We will collect input from the subcommittee first, and then open the comments to members of the community. We would like specific recommendations, the more detailed, the better since this is the opportunity to provide the feedback that we have been telling the city we would like to give.

     I will start by saying that my goal is to help the city produce a Land Use Scenario and an updated Community Plan that can win majority support on the Subcommittee and the UCPG which are charged with representing the interests in the University Community. The subcommittee represents diverse interests and points of view with specialized and intimate knowledge of the community that planners can use. The subcommittee members have invested thousands of hours collectively with the expectation that we can vote for, and ultimately produce, an updated community plan. Tonight, is a step in that direction.

     I will make room for comments from all of the members of the subcommittee first and follow that with comments from members of the community, including some those who wanted to make non-agenda public comments.

     Members of the Subcommittee, please share your comments on LUS2.

JS: I'll start with some questions. You sent us a request to do homework, and I've tried to do this. I have two preliminary questions needing answers prior to my making suggestions. What do the DU/acre [Dwelling Units / Acre] ranges look like? I need some examples to help, examples I've seen that I can tolerate, Mesa Nueva, for example. Very hard to comment without knowing that. Following up to Paul Goldstein's comment: I want information on where we

would find, and at what density, middle income housing and lower income housing. Third, I have pages of notes. How should I respond?

AW: All written comments should be sent directly to the city. Share your ideas with the sub-committee. We have two hours to do that.

JS: I'm hoping that Nancy or Suchi can help with the first two questions. Where do the lower and moderate-income residents fit into this model? It's likely not in the higher density units. I have multiple pages of notes. Where should I send the comments.

AW: The September 2021 CPUS presentation has visuals for DU/acre.

AW: Mesa Nueva is 143 DU/acre.

NG: Boards for May meeting have per-Focus Area DU/acre.

NG: The higher you make density, the easier it is to add moderate- and low-income units. Higher density will be more affordable. The most affordable land use type will be the highest density.

AW: I'd like to clarify: your statement may appear true, but it is the case that if we are looking at wide-ranging income levels, lower rise housing is cheaper to build. Seven stories, about 85 feet, is the sweet spot for frame construction, which is less expensive to build and more likely to result in a mix of more affordable rents. In University, high rise construction produces the highest rents.

KR: LUS2 looks great but includes areas outside of the Focus Areas (FA).
FA3: Good Samaritan Church shows Urban Village High density; it should be a church.
FA3 adjacent: Vista La Jolla has medium density, should be lower.
FA4 adjacent: Corner of Villa La Jolla and Gilman Dr has been up zoned but the neighbors have not. Is this because it's rental property? The height limit is exceeded.
FA5: Greenwich [East Governor near I-805] It's labeled Urban Village but it is not close to transit. The Fire Marshall does not like the single access. Why not leave the parcel as office and commercial?
We spent three years doing FAs, but changes in LUS 1 and LUS 2 are spread all over. Get rid of things outside the FAs, stick with changes discussed for the FAs.

DiM: I have a question and comment on purple areas in LUS2. A large number of the purple areas are commercial, but we're only seeing residential density displayed for them. Are we increasing or adding commercial entitlements, and also increasing entitlement for residential areas? Some of the purple areas show a range of housing units with zero as a minimum. Is this intentional or are there details missing? Everyone needs to keep in mind that all entitlements will cause land price to increase. None of the other factors in the plan (such as parks and

infrastructure) are guaranteed in the same way that LU entitlement increases will result in an increase in value.

VA: I support KR and DiM comments.   Have a question on Regents and Governor Land Use. The four corners are red. Is the idea to build housing on the Church property? My comments are based on a being a resident and parent of little kids. I believe this is a dialog: we listen to the city, the city listens to people, and we take each other's comments. Parents like walkability, walk to the library and grocery. [AW shared two slides from VA]. Slide 1 has proposals to the city [can we bullet point or summarize these here?], slide 2 is what we like about the city proposals. It's very important to preserve the height of the shopping center. If there is mixed use and apartments, we need to think about the parking. We need to think about incorporation of recreation. Need to have access to roads, churches, and housing. What we need to keep in mind is housing for UCSD students and housing issues that the city faces.

PK: I'm very concerned about the way the planning process was executed. If I were doing this, I'd look at what resources we have and go forward. Take parks. Per policy we are supposed to have 2.8 acres/1000 residents. This is now 1.3 acres / 1000 people which is half of the required amount. Increases in the number of residents by a factor of two, more residents under the plan update proposal, gives us a quarter or 0.65 acres / 1000 residents. We could have anticipated four years ago that there just isn't enough space to build the required parks. We need to ensure sufficient parks for future residents. We should protect current open space and MSCP lands, open space, and protect the canyon edge. We should build the overlook parks at Regents Rd. and Rose Canyon. Limit development to a density of 143 DU / acre. Go high but leave space for outdoor recreation. Prohibit payment of in-lieu fees and require building parks on site. Displacement should be outlawed, with affordable housing on site.

DK: Friends of Rose Canyon put a list together. We endorse almost all the comments made so far. Maximum density should be 143 DU / acre. The "dark purple" mixed use is almost Hong Kong type building density. We have a big University and biotech industry. We are not a residential high-rise community. Outdoor recreation space for all residential should be on site, otherwise we won't see it in the community. If we don't do this, in-lieu elsewhere won't do it either. The overlook parks are the only "new" land for parks. There should be setbacks near canyons, with the adjacent MHPA canyon area east of Genesee Highlands limited to three stories. The least expensive rental housing is southwest of Genesee and Nobel. Replacement housing there should be low-rise, without displacement. Along Genesee north of Eastgate Mall, there are steep, vertically walled canyons just east of the apartments. Replacing the housing with higher density would be a disaster for the MHPA. Development next to the canyon here is a problem. The creation of parks for any new residential should be on-site. Where are the parks in the plan? People want recreational opportunities. The land west of I-5 is nowhere near the Nobel recreational area. We should require on-site affordable units. Fancy high rise units won't trickle down. Protect all MSCP and Open Space.

RC: DK covered areas I'm concerned with. The area on the southwest corner of Genesee and Nobel are the most affordable units in the area. If kept at two stories, it remains

affordable. If not, we'd have high towers there. We have a long history of displacement if we build market rate housing. It won't work with 10% affordable. There is no provision for middle income. A comment was made earlier that if we build more high density, we'd get more affordable housing, including middle income. I see that if we build high density, we get exactly the 10% but no more. We really need a scope of affordable housing that mirrors the community. We should lobby the city to have something like 20% affordable (low/very low) and 20-30-40% moderate income housing. Capital Improvements are short by $2 billion, with a $4.7B deficit soon. The signal at Lakewood and Governor took 12 years (2010-2022) for a $200,000 improvement. There is a $250 million shortfall in streetlights. The distribution of wealth in this country is not conducive for producing great communities. I suggest we move to lower density along Decoro Ave (to prevent displacement). We don't want to replicate downtown where 25,000 units were destroyed. This is not all that good for the health of the community.

JS: Great comments, KR. I completely overlooked the FAs. Land use scenarios should concentrate on them. East of I-805 we have restricted industrial. Given what's going on we should be more creative about this area for added commercial development. No housing there. All scenarios need private and public parks. We need to find more recreation fields that are open to the public. Campus Pointe is a cul-de-sac that is a concern for emergencies. South of Campus Pointe Dr. is magenta: there are condos there and should be noted as such. Across from Campus Pointe east of Regents is labeled visitor commercial. JCC isn't a community park. South of Nobel west of Genesee should not be high-rise. Some privately owned condos in La Jolla Colony are incorrectly marked. Open space east of Rose Canyon – is there space to be included in the OS park? Overlook parks on north and south side of Rose Canyon at Regents should be created. We need to be concerned about family housing with 3-4 bedrooms in the area. I don't see how the plan accommodates medium size families. I know what high density does to parking on the east coast and in Chicago. We should consider parking structures and permitted parking. Lack of parking can make the area unlivable.

MC: Represents BIOCOM CA. I will be frank with everyone. I've been part of the process for four years. The zoom chat has gotten ugly with personal attacks. According to the community atlas we are 79% under age 50, 53% non-white. What do we want the future opportunities to look like? Many are students, who pay taxes and want to live here. They deserve respect. The definition of NIMBY is it's OK to build housing, but just somewhere else. We do have a housing crisis. Insisting on covenant restrictions is another method of exclusionary policy. Can someone who makes $127K / year afford a $900K house? No. The density proposed will happen over twenty years, not overnight. We need high density housing for students who graduate and want to stay. UC San Diego graduates more STEM degrees than Harvard and MIT combined. Please support your life science community here.

JM: Representing Alexandria Real Estate. I've been on the update since the start. On the heights of buildings: if given equal density or intensity, high rises can be more sustainable, more efficient, occupy less space, and can be architecturally more elegant if the heights vary. High density does not equal high cost. Height restrictions exist in specific overlays already. We don't need to address this in the Plan Update.

[Recording time point 1:31].

AW: [Displays his Scenario 2 slide with comments and suggestions for changes.] I presented these comments in April, and I shared an update with the city again this month. [See attachment]. I personally believe that LUS2 with fixes can serve as the basis for a LUS we can support for the future, for both commercial and residential. In its favor, LUS2 includes robust commercial and residential development, maximizes transit potential, creates flexibility through mixed use, supports the CAP and reaffirms some environmental commitments. We need to work to ensure the parks (e.g., rambla, overlook parks) actually get built to ensure the quality of life for a growing community. The downside of LUS2 is that it is deficient in affordable housing, supports displacement of residents in the lowest priced housing, as well as small businesses, and it sets up avoidable conflicts between housing, retail and core industry that could undermine plan update goals. These flaws can be corrected. I suggest the following general principles and specific changes. The plan update should **Maximize Affordable Housing**. We need a broad range of affordable housing in University as reflected in our adopted 2019 CPU goal of a diverse community. We need 15% on-site affordable residential for development over 10 DU. Barrio Logan CPU included a 15% inclusionary requirement with no in-lieu. The Future Urbanizing Area developed with a 20% requirement. We should opt out of any policy that includes in-lieu payments for affordable housing to make sure that housing gets built here near the jobs. The CPU should minimize displacement of existing housing and small businesses by avoiding direct displacement of the most affordable housing/business properties in the plan area, planning housing for sites currently zoned commercial, and including anti-displacement regulations to require the rehousing of existing tenants and replacement of lost units *by rent level*. We should Plan for proven levels of high-density development that will permit development of a diverse community. Follow the Mesa Nueva model of 143 DU / acre, eight stories, affordable with significant open space and vibrant street life. Housing at this scale is less costly to build and can be priced more affordably. It is a real-world model for inclusive, affordable, high-density urbanism. By contrast, the mixed-use densities of 200+ DU acre will reproduce the problems it created Downtown (displacement, increased homelessness, runaway rents, hyper polarization). 200du/ac is unlikely to produce the parks or open space needed by a growing population.

In addition to these general principles, the revised LUS should make these specific adjustments:
   A. Protect community retail and promote affordable housing at La Jolla Village Square with appropriate zoning. Zone residential and community village (not mixed use) to en-sure development of housing and to protect community serving retail. Mixed use will set up displacement by more competitive uses: Bio tech, high tech, HQ. There is space for these uses elsewhere in UC.
   B. Avoid displacement and preserve affordability at Southwest corner of Genesee and No-bel. This is the most affordable housing in UC and it should remain the basis for mix of rents and incomes in future. Preserve lower rise housing here, assure anti displacement regs. No RMX zone or density which will invite displacement by luxury towers.
   C. Excalibur Way development should be maintained at the current use.

D. Require housing (RMX) at UTC, particularly the Palisade and Sears sites. Zone to the Palisades density of 165 DU/acre. UTC must be part of the housing solution; it cannot be all commercial as currently shown in the LUS.

E. Plan for housing (RMX) adjacent to Trolley stations (including UTC) and adjoining Executive Drive Paseo - to make sure it is a Paseo or Rambla. "No housing no Rambla." Large corporate owners of these properties must be part of the housing solution in UC.

F. Plan for better park access to Weiss park (Regents and Exec Drive).

LP: I'd like to thank AW for the nice summary of what we've been discussing over the last year. I will add a couple of concerns. A portion of incremental densities should be in south UC but pushback causes north UC to be denser. North UC should not have to have higher density to compensate. On the corner of Torrey Pines and La Jolla Village Drive there is a "purple" parcel but we need to look at UCSD is doing just across the street and be careful about traffic. On community parks: land is very expensive but I would not be supportive of a plan to put in community parks that are postage stamp sized. This is not recreation and can't be a recreation area. The city should pony up money to build parks.

PK: What will happen to these ideas, AW? Post-it notes do not seem to incorporate them.

AW: I have already shared my written comments w the city [attached].

NG: We already created a Jam Board for this presentation ahead of time.

DK: Masaki Mendoza put a comment into the chat about bike lockers, bike lanes, and so forth. Points out that the city came up with a plan for protected bike lanes on Genesee from SR-52 to I-5 but given experience with deficient bike infrastructure in the current plan, I don't think this will happen during the lifetime of this new plan.

NG: This is not a land use discussion.

DK: We do need to assume more bikes and scooters in the future.

AW: We have comments from Save UC. Linda Beresford will have six minutes.

Linda Beresford: I am from Help Save UC. Earlier we facilitated the petition to remove the proposals to rezone the single family streets for townhomes. We thank the city for withdrawing that proposal. Currently UC has 27K homes. LUS1 proposes 83K homes and LUS2 proposes 62K homes. This is 196 Palisades buildings for LUS1, and 117 Palisades towers for LUS2. This is not reasonable. It still isn't clear how the city came up with the numbers in the LUS they proposed. The SANDAG grant application specified that the area should plan for 10K to 30K new housing units. What changed to produce such a large increase? The area cannot accommodate the number of proposed housing units. New housing development must incorporate usable open space in its design. The plan update should minimize displacement of current residential units. New housing should be adjacent to the trolley with a mid-rise density of 140 DU acre

within a quarter mile of the trolley. All other blocks south of La Jolla Village Drive should have a maximum of 54 DU acre. All parcels adjacent to the trolley should have a residential component to them. Our retail shops must be protected in our shopping centers, especially grocery stores and small retail. Parking must be provided for both residents and users of the commercial in our shopping centers. Heights in Sprouts and Vons shopping centers must reflect the character of the surrounding residential. Sprouts is not in a TPA. Setbacks from existing housing must be retained. No single family homes should be rezoned. Base zoning should include affordable housing.

Madison Coleman: I represent the Climate Action Campaign. We must take a holistic approach to planning and housing. High density does not mean lack of space. The UCCPU should prioritize affordable housing, on-site, mixed use, multi-family units near transit and parks. The housing should be near transit, walking and biking paths, and amenities. The city must provide mode share data early on rather than at the end, as is current policy. Must have information early on to make informed decision. Need to consult with all members of the community, including historically overlooked members of the community. All should benefit from the improvement in the community. We support a UC specific, inclusionary, affordable housing policy that goes beyond the current inclusionary housing proposals.

Rachael Graham: Graduate of UC San Diego. I've heard comments that up zoning the university community area will destroy its character. Buildings don't give a community its character, people do. The character will be destroyed if no one can afford to live there. High density development is the only way to ensure the ability to live in this area.

Karen Arden: I'm still puzzled by the issue about how they came up with the numbers.

Andrew Barton: Few doubt the need to create more housing. Building more reduces rents regionally but not locally. Many of the units are proposed at very high density. A studio rents for $4k / month. I encourage the city to limit density to 140 DU / acre. UCSD is growing faster than housing and UCSD is unable to keep up, so student will be forced to compete for high rise units which will make them even more unaffordable. Make LUS2 exclude > 140 DU / acre.

Jen Dunaway: LUS1 and LUS2 are high density. We received lots of comments at these meetings on high density. What's been changed? I can't get comments from NG. The Vons and Sprouts shipping centers are not in walksheds or TPAs, and housing will compete with commercial. Parking is limited. If there is additional housing, it will compete for limited parking. These options really don't make sense given limited transit choice.

AW: Tonight, we are suggesting revisions to LUS2. The proof of the pudding will be next month when revisions are presented by the city.

NG: On changes, since the earlier proposals, we have removed the townhomes and revised the Vista La Jolla land use.

DK: Please save the chat.

NG: This will be included with the agenda, presentation, and recording.

Susan Baldwin: I am a retired planner and affordable housing advocate. I support a 15% inclusive without in-lieu but suggest the city consider a linkage fee for commercial development to support housing as part of the CPU, dedicated to the community, to purchase some apartments that are vulnerable to displacement. The business community needs to be part of the solution. Even though most jobs in tech pay well, for each tech job you get five service jobs. Three of the five do not usually require a college education.

John Madison: Universities are critical to the community and shouldn't need affordable housing. This is a problem across the country. It is a failure of the campus to plan for long term housing for their growth. I am concerned about the lack of open space that would accompany new housing. This does not even address the lack of open space for existing residents. At the UC High meeting, most participants were opposed to the higher density. We're told at this meeting that the city had withdrawn these proposals, but they are back in this plan. The real problem is the expansion of enrollment at the university without accompanying housing.

David Brodie: South UC shopping center residential housing should be in proportion to the surrounding homes. Current height in the commercial centers of two stories matches the surrounding residential. Parking is essential for units that are developed. We need to retain the commercial small businesses at these locations. Two of the four corners at Sprouts (Regents/Governor) have lost their original commercial development. This is a concern.

Jessie O'Sullivan: We face a housing shortage and climate crisis. We need to add more density in low VMT areas like UC. Affordable housing versus market rate housing: Downtown has more affordable housing than any other area. That's because it has so much market rate development, so more affordable housing is built as a result. Single family homes are the most expensive kind of housing in San Diego. Gentrification is a problem in Linda Vista and other areas. Building more here avoids gentrification elsewhere. Building codes apply regardless of the UC plan update document. UC is already more expensive than downtown. Building higher density housing goes with building more affordable housing.

Alex Tahan: Longtime resident. Previous surveys show LUS1 are more popular, so we need to keep in mind that more want LUS1 than LUS2. These voices need to be heard as well. Last month's presentation shows higher density supports the CAP. This area has both the trolley and the best service super loop bus routes as well.

Bonnie Kutch: Many subcommittee members had good points. The city has heard over seven months many comments that infrastructure hasn't been addressed. Any additional residents will impede traffic and threaten safety. The city has prepared LUS that ruin communities and work against the CAP. The city should focus more on community areas outside the underused

community commercial areas. Building thousands of new luxury units in UC won't address the housing needs of the community.

Lisa Heikoff: I support more parks and green space, and small areas aren't satisfactory. I support AW and KR comments along with Save UC comments. The plan changes should not be considered "changed" yet.

Jennifer Martin-Roff: As a parent I wonder how existing schools can support the increased population. No areas have been cited for additional schools should the capacity of the current schools be inadequate. UCHS and Standley Middle School are the only ones in the area. Please don't forget about the schools in the community design.

Rolf Holstein: UC is what it is because of UCSD. Students are looking for affordable housing. UCSD should build housing on campus that pulls back students from the community to the campus.

Linda Bernstein: I'm a 40-year resident of south UC. I support what Linda Beresford proposed. I want to acknowledge you, Nancy Graham, tonight. I felt a glimmer of hope I've not felt in the last six months that you are listening to the community, and to homeowners. I feel there is some chance with the post it notes that you are listening to us and that the process can become iterative. I've just returned from Europe and listened to the Planning Commission meeting and became so disheartened with what was said, and the dismissal of homeowner concerns. I don't feel that way today. Costa Verde is a great loss to the community and losing Bristol Farms was a big loss. I wonder if anything be done. We lost both retail and restaurants. Bristol Farms was a key supermarket for this part of the community. The community would like to know what the long-term plan is for this corner.

AW: I appreciate your generosity and hopefulness in your comments. I appreciate all the comments. It's important work we are doing. We have raised the level of that discussion tonight and I look forward to next month's discussion.

8:38   We are adjourned