



## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday November 15, 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 Cavanaugh (RC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Petr Krysl (PK), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU), Dinesh Martien (DiM)

##### *Members not present:*

Kris Kopensky (KK), 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

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

Tait Galloway (TG) – Deputy Director, Planning Department

Natalie Koski-Karell (NK) – 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.

Fourteen members present at start of meeting, sixteen members at 6:13 for the presentation start.

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

October 18, 2022, minutes are not ready to review.

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

**6:10 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no non-agenda public comment.

**6:11 Revised Land Use Scenario Discussion – Nancy Graham and Suchi Lukes**

Reference: “November 2022 – Revised Land Use Scenarios: Presentation PDF” on [planuniversity.org/meetings](http://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.]

[Nancy Graham will present LUS Scenario A; Suchi Lukas will present LUS Scenario B.]

NG: [Gives presentation for Scenario A.]

[4] Possible Scenarios. Discussion tonight will be “Staff Recommended Scenario A” and “CPG Directed Scenario B”. A possible Optional Additional Scenario is a possible future topic.

[5] Current Scenario 2. Buildout Estimate is 33,000 new housing units with 80,000 new jobs.

[6] Proposed Scenario A. A tweak to current Scenario 2:

Scenario A: Scenario 2: Delta A – 2:

Housing	30,000 DU	33,000 DU	-3,000 DU
Jobs	70,000 Jobs	80,000 Jobs	-10,000 Jobs

[7] Updated Density Ranges: Urban Village (0-109 DU/AC) split into Urban Village (0 – 90 DU/AC) and Urban Village (0 – 145 DU/AC). There was a mismatch in FAR in Scenario A, with a 3 FAR corresponding to 54 DU/AC and 7 DU/AC a middle density. In Scenario A, the middle density DU/AC straddles the Scenario 2 DU/AC with a new Urban Flex added.

Scenario 2:	Scenario A:	FAR
Urban Village (0 – 54 DU/AC)	Urban Flex (0 – 54 DU/AC)	New, but EMX for TZ
	Urban Village (0 – 90 DU/AC)	3.0
Urban Village (0 – 109 DU/AC)	Urban Village (0 – 145 DU/AC)	5.0
Urban Village (0 – 218 DU /AC)	Urban Village (0 – 218 DU/AC)	

[8] Shows the Blueprint Analysis for Scenario A.

[9] Existing Urban Core (“2”) from the existing plan.

[10] Focus Areas, all proposed plans. The most significant changes are here, but all plan areas are affected. Idea was to make the most significant changes in Focus Areas but reflect equivalent parcels outside the Focus Areas.

[11] Changes shown between Scenario 2 and Scenario A. Stepped down, but 218 - 145 vs. 109. Bring down the density a bit reflecting likelihood of redevelopment. Condos are unlikely to change, so reflect that. Remove residential designations impacted by MCAS Miramar. Leave Greenwich (near I-805) to office commercial as in existing plan. A concept is to step down density from transit at Nobel and I-5 towards the existing residential. This is about a 10% density reduction, hitting the 30,000-unit level (from the 33,000 originally in Scenario 2).

NG: Questions on Scenario 2 → Scenario A?

AW: Can you distinguish between those set to be RMX and those set to be EMX?

NG: This is based on practice throughout the city. Existing commercial is assigned EMX, otherwise it does not make sense. If it's existing residential, this is assigned RMX. We will take the property owner's considerations into account, particularly if it's likely to redevelop after the plan update is adopted. We did this in the Mission Valley CPU. If you have a portfolio that is existing commercial it can be difficult to add RMX. We would like to see service businesses

paired with residential. A specific RMX or EMX category is a zoning decision not a Land Use Scenario designation for the plan. Zoning would be done later.

AW: I have a question on a couple of parcels.

NG: We haven't seen requests yet to switch designations from commercial to residential or residential to commercial. Usually this happens a bit later on in the process.

AW: What about Nobel west of I-5? Would these be EMX?

NG: Yes, since they are existing commercial, they would begin as EMX. Could be modified later.

SL: We've been asked to clarify what RMX, EMX, and DU mean.

NG: RMX and EMX are mixed-use zones: RMX require more than 50% residential. EMX does not require residential, but more than 50% would be for "employment uses". EMX-1 or RMX-1 is a 3 FAR, EMX-2 or RMX-2 is a 5 FAR, and EMX-3 or RMX-3 is a 7 FAR. The adjustment of the DU/AC for each FAR was part of the reason for the changes in Scenario A.

[12] Existing Dwelling Units Protection Regulations.

[13] Side-by-side comparison of Scenario 2 and Scenario A.

[14] Scenario B CPG directed housing and jobs numbers:

*Scenario B was derived by applying the comments given at the October CPUS meeting (and earlier feedback) to Scenario 2.*

	Scenario B:	Scenario 2:	Delta A – 2:
Housing	22,000 DU	33,000 DU	-11,000 DU
Jobs	55,000 Jobs	80,000 Jobs	-25,000 Jobs

These numbers are **additional** jobs or housing units.

[15] Scenario B changes from Scenario 2.

- Limited changes outside the Focus Areas.
- Maximum density of 145 DU/AC.
- Community Village designation at Nobel west of I – 5 at 109 DU/AC. The intent is to preserve community serving uses in this area (retail, grocery, etc.). Bonus program could bring up the density to 145 DU/AC.
- No change to the adopted land uses in south UC.

[16] Comments related to inclusionary housing, setbacks, and parking area addressed in the Community Discussion Draft.

[17] Side-by-side comparison between Scenario 2 and Scenario B.

NG: Discussion?

AW: I would like to begin with Subcommittee members, but there is a lot of material and detail here, so some Q&A should be encouraged.

NG: One more comment: In Scenario B there is no down zoning. The city is not willing to entertain these proposals due to state law.

KR: I'll ask again about the churches along Executive Drive. Why are these not marked as institutional? The land use makes them urban village. I'd like to talk about the single-family zones off of Towne Centre Drive (Vista La Jolla).

NG: Churches are private property and if churches with to be institutional we would entertain it, but this would limit their use under redevelopment. Churches could add residential if desired. We could move to a medium density use along Executive and give them a residential designation. This would remove the commercial designation but avoid a downzoning in moving from (current) commercial to (proposed) residential.

KR: Churches at Eastgate and Genesee have covenants prohibiting use for housing.

NG: Private covenants would still stand unless change is pursued in state law.

AL: I have a question on Scenario A. I'm confused about the mechanics for this. The urban node designation around transit stops was 290 DU/AC, and now it is 219 DU/AC.

NG: I started with Scenario 2; 290 was in Scenario 1. For 290 DU/AC, the zoning would be an "RMX-4" which does not exist. We could make this adjustment. This is also equivalent to the urban core density.

AL: So deepest level purple is 290 DU/AC but there is currently no zone for that?

NG: Zones are created all the time so this is not an impediment, but so far I have not seen many requests to have this highest density here. We can take input to do this as well.

AL: I would like to see more density round transit stops; the density proposed is not high enough. So, Scenario B is way, way under what we need. This would not help achieve reduced carbon emissions or help us move away from car centric uses. Scenario A is much closer but I'm

not happy with the 10% reduction in housing density. The Planning Commission recommended maximum densities near transit, even higher than Scenario 1.

PK: I'm pleased to see a Scenario B maximum density of 143 DU/AC, which is much more reasonable. When I hear requests for higher density, I note that European cities do not have this density and they are not dependent on cars. Paris and Amsterdam don't have this density. We can do our plan at this lower density. A reason for lower density is including open space and parks. We haven't heard anything about in-lieu fees. On-site affordable units are highly desirable. What are those protections? Also, there should be a requirement of developing park space into new development rather than in-lieu fees.

NG: Parks could be included in a CPIOZ as has been done in other plans.

PK: These are being presented as details, but they are essential if you live there.

NG: I don't disagree. We need to have a land use plan to coalesce around. That's why there is a focus on one or two scenarios.

DiM: To understand "scaling", how many live in a unit on average.

NG: Different for different communities. I assumed a 900 sq. ft. unit, on average but it depends on where the units are and depends on what gets built. Try to incentivize family households as well as studios and one-bedroom. There are many options to consider and they affect the size of the rooms, if they are micro-units, and so forth. It's possible with a community of students there could be demand for micro-units, for example. Emphasize floor-area-ratio rather than just DU/AC.

DiM: What are the proposed land uses at the Sprouts and Vons in Scenario B?

NG: There are different height limits for Vons and Sprouts. Take Scenario A, apply CC-3-8 zone for both, otherwise it will be a disallowed down zone. Office zone at the I-805 (no change).

DiM: Does the adopted land use currently allow residential currently?

NG: Yes.

DK: I feel we have something to discuss that we did not before. Scenarios A and B are good but I would like to see an Alt-A that the subcommittee could support, giving us Scenario A and Scenario Alt-A. If we make adjustments and compromise it might work. Otherwise, I'm afraid that if it is A and B, with A being the staff recommended, A will just be adopted. This is always the way with the many EIRs I have seen. I have these suggestions for an Alt-A. North of Decoro to Nobel has a huge impact onto the MSCP just to the south: the heights in that parcel should be brought down even in Scenario B. Reduce the density for the apartments on Genesee north

of Eastgate next to the canyons. Campus Pointe is pretty good now in Scenario A with the height reduction on housing near Nissan but a reduction could be done. We should have a discussion about Vons/Sprouts shopping area. I think there should be some change there and see if there is something the community could agree on. Please give us the time to come up with an Alt-A that most of the community could agree on. Park space: decide before or after the EIR? I don't see this as a secondary issue, either (agree with PK). Parks are essential.

NG: Property owners were not notified. I received a lot of phone calls today. We need to hold to our policy goals and objectives and are still open to changes but we are not likely to make too many changes to Scenario A. As we transition to the next phase, we need have the staff and community versions ready. We need to get the whole picture on the table. The EIR will be done after the community draft. We need to transition towards the plan. Staying in one place doesn't work.

DK: So, does the park plan get decided now?

NG: No, this plan is being developed in parallel, and will go through a discussion and analysis with the community before incorporation into the environmental analysis. We do a discussion draft first, then analyze, then revise.

AW: Does the community discussion draft include parks?

NG: It is a first draft of the plan and includes everything. Then, we make changes, start the EIR and create a final draft. This way the entire plan can begin to be visualized.

JS: The Vons in La Jolla Colony and Renaissance. Community Village, 0-73 DU/AC. The RMX and EMX distinctions would allow, or require, housing? Would office use be allowed?

NG: Community Commercial would be required to have retail and could build commercial above that. Or residential above retail.

JS: La Jolla Village Square. I think of it as a low-rise mall. I would like to see a log of residential on top of the retail. It's important when increasing the height limit here that a lot of the increase would go towards residential. 143 DU/AC limit. This will be considered by the community when considering the height limit. This needs to be guaranteed in some sense. Parks: There is no land. Is there a way to develop a recreational park with playing field on the east side of 805? This would not be far from the existing community. The lack of playing fields is a problem.

NG: You won't get support for changing open space to recreation area. There will be opposition from the UCPG and resource agencies.

DK: Those area are in the MSCP, and other areas are in the APZ 1 and APZ 2.

VA: Does this proposal include current development (like the La Jolla Innovation Center at the corner of Villa La Jolla and La Jolla Village Drive)? This looks to be very high. What's the difference between neighborhood commercial and regional commercial. What about the old Costa Verde site? Are you looking at Sprouts and Vons to be something like One Paseo?

NG: To see what stores might look like that include housing, look in Mission Hills along Washington St. Regional commercial is not a designation we'll be keeping. The trend for these shopping centers is to do infill-type development. Neighborhood commercial is in the immediate area, with mixed use replacing the old regional commercial.

AW: I thank staff for the iterative process. We got stalled last December, but we're back on track now. I appreciate all the work that has been done, thanks to Nancy and Tait. I think it was unfortunate that an imaginary density was put forward, whetting the appetite of those for whom extreme densities appeal. It's good to have some of the numbers for understanding. For an LU discussion it's not critical that we drill down to the granular level. More important are which types of jobs go up or down: we need to know where the jobs are and what kind. A square foot breakout of jobs would be good, jobs/housing ratio, and better, a jobs/housing "fit" fitting the population to the jobs. I would say that there are opportunities to get RMX or housing in areas that are zoned urban village along Eastgate, UTC, and Nobel Transit, particularly next to the trolley stops that seem dominated by commercial. Scenarios A and B really need inclusionary housing. I've proposed 15% in the past and I've argued before for this. Policies are later, but I'd like them on the sticky board now. I'm still concerned that Scenarios A and B replace the least expensive housing by most expensive housing. Scenario A sets up a housing and commercial vs. R&D/office as a conflict that should be avoided. In Nobel Square no retail would be required or incentivized. There is no requirement that any retail remains there. Retail does not compete well with Biotech, but it's especially important if we are adding lots of residential. We've already lost Bristol Farms. If we put those two uses, biotech and retail, in competition (through mixed use zoning), biotech wins. We should avoid this conflict and designate a land use that supports the retail use. I agree with JS that a justification for raising the height limit here is that there be housing and retail there. This provision is in Scenario B but not A.

NG: We recommend mixed use as they are a better development tool but we could add a CPOS adding residential and still be flexible with a CPOS, but an EMX zone keeps is better for a previous use. Mira Mesa does have such a provision of minimum residential. The development regulations for regional commercial are different than community commercial. It is currently regional commercial.

AW: We could keep the current zone if there is an issue of conformity. It would not just be displacement of housing, but of retail, so we should not let that go here. I will continue to push against changes to sw corner of Nobel and Genesee that would replace the most affordable units in the area with some of the most expensive in the area. It would intensify the housing affordability crisis for a range of incomes. I appreciate that the city has made provision for displacement of low and very low income, but there are renters that don't fall into that income category who cannot afford the market rents across the street. There is no econ 101 that



makes this work. If you replace the cheapest housing with the most expensive, rents go up. That site also includes 50 units owned by the housing commission (Pulitzer Place). A final comment on Scenario B: We should reconsider if there is potential for more housing on the two commercial sites in south UC. This is a process that will require compromise and it's something to work on for what we want 30 years from now. Lots has changed over 30 years and will continue to do so. These are the most suitable sites for housing in south UC. I like the Scenario A designs for Vons. Since the land values are lower there, it might be the most inexpensive option for housing in the plan area.

MC: With respect to displacement comments: building more housing at any level allows everyone to benefit. I'm wondering why lower density is proposed after the Planning Commission workshop. There was a large amount of public comment in favor of higher density and I'm wondering if NG could address this.

NG: If there is a desire to see Scenario 1 or 2 return this could happen. For the last 5 months, the community has given comments that the density was too high, and that about a 10% reduction would acknowledge this, including areas that won't redevelop (like condos). By making these adjustments it's an opportunity to react to the comments. If there is support for LUS 1, these voices need to amplify.

MC: The population that attend these meetings don't replicate the demographics of the community. Why aren't we using the survey results or the community atlas. In this new, new, version of these scenarios, the most dense option is lower density than the highest density previously proposed. Some of the densities proposed for the trolley areas are less than half the prior densities proposed where the biggest transit investment has been. This does not make sense for students and tech commuters, nor does it help meet the climate action goals set by the city. This is the place where it makes sense to increase the density. We've already agreed to not increase the density of the single-family zones in south UC: these are the loudest voices who can spend the time to argue their points at these meetings where others cannot spend this time. I'm really concerned the voice is skewed in this direction. I would urge the city to reconsider the comments based on the demographics of this population.

PK: Look at scenario A and B, a total of 82K DU or 62K DU we'd get a population of 180K or 135K. Area where this is located in north UC, in an area of about 4 SQ. Kilometers. This proposes increasing the density of this area to Paris (80K) density and beyond. This is a real increase in density of people. Scenario B backs off some, but it is still a lot. I don't know why this is not enough for some people.

AB: Scenario B is a move in the right direction. Difference maps 2-> A and 2-> B should be made with a maximum of 143 DU/AC. 290 DU/AC in Scenario 1 is undesirable and should not be considered. Vons/Sprouts to be thought out in Scenario A; the proposed density is too high. There is no mention of parks in the plan. These should be part of Scenarios A and B. Reduce density withing ¼ mile of the MSCP. The plan is too deferential to EMX zoning. We need to have housing as part of redevelopment.

NG: We can't take private property for a park designation. It is a taking and not allowed by law. We can't build parks into the land use plan. We can incorporate city owned land into parks or use city funding.

AB: I had a conversation with park planners. There is no path that gets us to a required park plan using park point totals or the existing park plan. Most important is a realistic discussion on this issue.

Bill Beck: NG explained about the down zone of Vista La Jolla issue. A question on Renaissance. Could it be developed differently? Could you explain?

NG: If someone owns the site, we could zone to community commercial designation. We could make 100% of the units affordable so we could not restrict completely to housing but would have retail on the ground floor with housing above.

LB: Losing supermarkets is a disaster. There are no supermarkets in northeast UC now. We cannot afford that. Trulux, Flemmings, and the Melting Pot are likely to close at the Aventine. In place of that, some kind of arts/science complex is planned. I'm confused on the designation of the Sprouts center as community commercial; I thought it was neighborhood commercial.

Hunter Oliver: I have property at the NW corner of I-805 and La Jolla Village Dr. Smart development is needed. The Planning Commission asked for housing and commercial, so mixed use works for us. We could not build what we proposed earlier so this part of the plan needs revision. We support the goals along the La Jolla Village Dr. of the plan.

NG: If individual owners have concerns, we can work to accommodate you.

IK: Thanks to all who serve on the CPUS. How would our area compare with Mission Valley?

NG: Newer buildings in Mission Valley were submitted prior to the Plan Update and are the models for EMX and RMX. Mission Valley has RMX/EMX -1, -2, but no -3. UC would have the first -3 with the a not-yet-created -4 at 290 DU/AC.

IK: We need to have smart policies adjacent to the MSCP. Can't use MSCP for recreation areas. We should require open space as part of development, just like parking spaces.

NG: There are open space requirements as part of the development regulations as long as it's public open space.

IK: Maybe this should be an explicit requirement. We'll be building a ghetto here, and not a good one.

NG: We can make these explicit.

David Brodie: Is it possible to view this meeting?

NG: It will up by the end of the week.

Ellie Yakutan: Nancy, where is your sense as to your superiors vs. Scenario B?

NG: Policy is by the Mayor, then the Planning Commission reviews and recommends, and then the City Council adopts the plan. There are ways to present different scenarios.

Ellie: In your review of Scenario B, are there conflicts with the CAP and could we see what the conflicts are?

NG: Very high density near transit is the best way to satisfy the CAP. We don't believe Scenario B will meet that objective, but we will still analyze the scenario. It will be challenging to meet the mode share needs with Scenario B based on staff's experience, so would be less likely to be adopted by council for this reason.

Jessie O'Sullivan. Circulate San Diego. Scenario 1 should be an option in the EIR. Supported by the community survey so it is the most accurate gauge of community opinion. Boomhower at the Planning Commission said this is a minimum. We made a \$2B investment in the trolley and siting housing there maximizes that housing and the environmental benefit. Not building in this area adds to gentrification across the city and increases to the carbon emissions. A version of Scenario 1 needs to be included in the EIR so the council can see it.

Steven Bossi: La Jolla Village Square site executive. Density around the trolley station. If we are not going to build highest density around the trolley station, then where are we going to build it. Discouraged about housing being removed in the proposal. Counter to the CAP checklist and goals.

Pablo Linetta: I'm happy with Land Use scenario B and that 1 and 2 are not in the picture. We need to protect supermarkets. We don't want to be in the same position with the Spouts and Vons that we were with the Bristol Farms. We want to have walking access to this retail. It would be great to know that not all the housing will be luxury and that there will be some affordable housing included.

Rachael Graham: I'm a graduate of UC San Diego. I'm extremely concerned about the reduction in housing and don't see the need or rationale for the reduction. We need to take advantage of the transit in the area.

Alex Tahan: The demographics of the commentators does not match the community. The needs of students, renters, and low-income workers were represented by the survey. If we do not develop housing near transit we risk not meeting our CAP goals and meeting legal

requirements. Bring back Scenario 1. Condos might not redevelop but this is 30-50 years, so leave in the higher density for the future but realize they might be long term.

Jen Dunaway: Please include a discussion on traffic and parks. I don't think we've gone far enough on density to change the plan based on the 100s of comments received so far on the plan. The Sprouts plan is unrealistic. I'd like to see any metrics to support this.

Craig Benedetto: NAOP SD. This is an association of commercial real estate property owners. We have not had the chance to review the proposed development scenarios yet. Our members believe that density along transit is critically important and there should be higher density, not less. This area is job rich and will become more job rich, so placing housing here is critically important to the reduction of VMT and to help meet our Climate Action goal. There is a misconception that any increase in density makes any redevelopment feasible. This is untrue with the increase of regulation that new development is subject to. We'd don't support the use of CPOZ controls after the plan is adopted; this has proved problematic in other areas. We do not support separate inclusionary housing rules apart from the rest of the city. We support using Scenario 1 as the minimum density in the plan as the starting point.

Linda Beresford: Scenarios A and B are steps in the right direction. I do realize any of the scenarios increases density significantly; it's a matter of how much. The survey had two thirds of the respondents not completing the survey. I reiterate the need to keep the retail. If properties close to the trolley redevelop, they should include housing. This makes sense. I think the increased housing proposals in the two commercial centers in south UC should be reduced. All projects should require affordable or workforce housing and not in-lieu fee payments.

AW: I'll bring the meeting to a close here. I appreciate work of city staff. It takes diverse set of interests to provide for diverse needs. This was a meeting that moves us forward after a period of stasis. Everyone should look closely at the scenarios carefully and provide the requested feedback to Nancy Graham. I look forward to working with you all and thank you for a respectful, productive, meeting.

**Adjourned at 8:36.**