



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday April 18, 2023

Regular Time 6:00 PM

Meeting Roll Call

In Person Meeting

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room

6949 Genesee Avenue, San Diego, CA 92122

6:04 Overview of Meeting: Topics, Expectations for Conduct

- Andy Wiese:
 - Open the meeting with introductory remarks while awaiting a quorum.
 - Welcome to University City High School. I'm Andy Wiese, a member of the University Community Planning Group (UCPG), and chair of the subcommittee of the UCPG, a group that has been hearing and providing public feedback to City of San Diego on the University City Community Plan Update.
 - Here tonight is Chris Nielsen, chair of the UCPG, members of the Plan Update Subcommittee, Nancy Graham and Martin Flores from the city, and Michaela Valk from Mayors' office who are here in a listening capacity.
 - This is a working meeting of the subcommittee. We are here to listen to feedback on the discussion draft, which was presented publicly last week at the UCPG meeting. Tonight, the hope is for you to come with specific feedback on the draft plan.
 - This committee has been at work for 4.5 years. The goal for this work is to have a community plan ready for the city council to vote on before the end of the year. Tonight is the first of 3 meetings of the committee to hear and refine recommendations related to the community discussion draft and to present those recommendations to the city to make adjustments as necessary and to provide recommendations to the UCPG who will vote on the plan. We will condense feedback and work to land on specific feedback/comments that most of the people on the subcommittee can support. Tonight, we will focus on comments related to land use/mobility and supplemental development regulations. In May/June we will discuss parks, open space, and urban design/policies. We are keeping a matrix of feedback received so that the subcommittee can report what feedback has been proposed, what feedback has been incorporated and what feedback has not.
 - The essence of planning is balance – requiring us to look at the future from the present to imagine what a city might look like. There are many favorable features of the plan: there are robust commercial/residential uses that maximize the mid coast trolley, flexibility for future development using mixed use zones, support for the climate action plan, reaffirmation of the city's environmental commitment to open space and MSCP, and contributions to housing and jobs.

- The staff preferred scenario (“Scenario A”) has an additional 32,500 housing units in the UC community and 59,000 more jobs. This housing is in addition to more than 10K additional beds at UCSD recently completed or projected for completion in the next 2 years. This plan update has more housing in UC than any other plan area in San Diego. The SANDAG planning agency grant that kicked off this process had a goal for 20-30K new units, so the city’s proposal is a little on north side but is within the ballpark. The city estimates that its proposal would provide homes for an additional 80,000 residents, more than the population in San Diego grew from 2010 to 2020 and more than any other planning area in San Diego. There are 40 plus planning areas in San Diego.
- The plan includes 3 new linear parks, a pedestrian promenade on Executive Drive, an improved interface with UCSD’s East Campus, open space edge protection, onsite park requirements for residential development, onsite public space for commercial development, bike lanes infrastructure. The plan does not rezone single family areas in UC, The plan has language for prioritizing affordable housing, and language supporting preservation of community serving retail.
- UC is part of a larger whole of the City of San Diego. It is the most dynamic economic engine with biotech, life science, and high-tech industry. It has the leading theatre cluster, world class shopping, has a top 20 global university, has state and national leading hospitals. It is the most biodiverse part of the most biodiverse metro area in North America, and it is a great place to live, work, study, and build families and lives. We hope these things will remain the same when the committee is done with its work and the plan is updated. With all of this at stake, it is not surprising that emotions run high when talking about the future of our community. There is a great deal of money at stake for some, it is a landscape of home, and a landscape of hope for the future. It is also a region where global capitalism comes together with everyday life. We should expect to disagree tonight. But we should expect to disagree with respect and civility for one another. This is not just something I expect; we should expect it of one another and of ourselves.
- Rather than dedicate tonight to repeated comments, we ask those with similar comments to please write them on the comment cards so we may move the discussion forward as needed.

6:19 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: AW

Roll Call:

Members present:

Debby Knight (DK), Katie Rodolico (KR), Aidan Lin (AL), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU). City Staff: Nancy Graham –Planning Department, Andy Wiese (AW), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), George Lattimer (GL), Joanne Selleck (JS), Petr Krysl (PK).

Members not present:

Keith Jenne (KJ), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Anu Delouri (AD), Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department, Kristin Camper (KC), Melanie Cohn (MC), Kris Kopensky (KK).

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

6:22 Approval of the Minutes: March 2021, 2023

KR/DiM did not get the meeting minutes. CN: they should be on the website as a draft. JS: did not receive either.

AW: Will not vote on this item this week, since others did not see the meeting minutes, we will wait until the next meeting to adopt these minutes.

6:24 Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Jesse O'Sullivan: Policy Counsel at Circulate San Diego. Two months ago, I and other pro housing folks were here and every time a pro-housing got up to speak, they were booed, hissed at, and told their voices didn't matter. Word got out, and people knew what happened. When I asked people to show up to this meeting, it is a tough sell to get booed at, hissed at, and to be told your voice doesn't matter. So, when we hear the voices tonight, I ask that you please remember those who aren't here because they aren't welcomed here.
 - Public: Do you live here?
 - Public: if you are from an organization, you should say where you live!
 - AW: Everyone has a right to speak.
- Diane Durag: Sprouts is now slotted for 569 units. The Palisades has 300 units. At the last live meeting, the developer told us to close our eyes and imagine electric shuttles. I'd tell you to close your eyes and imagine traffic.
- Jen Dunaway: Question – How is the city documenting all of the verbal comments at these meetings? At the February meeting, there were a lot of verbal comments, and I didn't see anyone taking notes. I'm curious how those comments are being rolled up. The fellow mentioned Circulate SD - if you live in UC raise your hand - we have vested interests here and a quality of life here. If you don't live here, it's a public meeting and you're welcome to attend - I get that- but I think you should take your passion and go to your planning group. I have a hard time believing that those who don't live here have a vested interest. The City mentioned a housing crisis – I've asked them to define what that is, I've asked for data or studies that show how adding units reduces rents. Specific studies in CA would be transparent and show how that has been successful outside UC. We've added units here and rents have gone up. If studies show how adding more units decreases rents in CA, I'd love to see them.
 - AW: Comments are being recorded in minutes and being entered into a matrix
- Matt Ramirez O'Mera: Resident for 18 years. Apologies to you for not feeling like you were respected, there were a lot of jeers – and rightly so, it is justified. It's a very interesting city and community. Since I went to UCSD, I knew I wanted to be a member of the community, but I knew then that I wasn't part of the community. I wasn't part of the fabric of the

- community, I don't define being a resident as where I domicile. You're a resident when you're a part of the fabric of the community - when your kids pick up trash, where they go to school – I pulled my kids out of charter school because I wanted them to be part of this community. I plan to live and die in the house I live in because I want to be a member of the community. I feel offended by someone who doesn't have skin in the neighborhood to tell you what you should do in your community. The problems are not going to go away by getting on e-bikes, we're not going to use gondolas, or any idea you have in your head – you only need to look at downtown, look at Ash Street or other things that city has done. This is not the way to solve the problem.
- Tom Hekman: Mr. Wiese, you said “finding a plan the subcommittee can support.” The planning group are elected personnel supposed to represent the community. We shouldn't be putting forth a plan the subcommittee supports, we should be putting forward a plan the community supports. The purpose of people elected to positions is to represent a community. Also, there are certain requirements of state law that require those representing lobbying organizations to identify themselves, and I ask that they do that.
 - Nancy Powell: Resident since 1998 – it's a great place to live. I also think people who don't live here shouldn't have a say in any of this conversation. Go to your community. Why is 40% of total proposed housing that city of San Diego targeted for University City? There are 52 other communities, why is 40% to be built here?

6:31 Comments on Discussion Draft of the Community Plan – Land Use and Mobility

- AW: We have the community discussion draft before us and have received many comments over 4.5 years. Now we have specific language, policies, and diagrams before us and is valuable to have people in a room like this with specific knowledge of the various areas to make sure mistakes are not made and to have eyes on the document. This plan will be used by the UCPG and city staff to evaluate projects that come forward in the future. We will invite members of the community to provide feedback and I will try to turn questions into comments to make them most helpful. Then, we will move to a conversation by subcommittee members.
- Public Comments:
 - Lisa Heikoff: Retired physician, lived in UC since 1990, raised 3 kids, went to UCSD, great supporter of University. Concerned about the tenor of conversation in terms of ageism. There is a lot of advocacy by the student population – and that is important. Many residents here are seniors, some are original residents of the community. We, too, deserve respect and recognition. We are not going to get on our bicycles, we are not going to go to medical appointments by the trolley because it won't get us there. People want to age in place, people can't afford, nor do we want, to go to the Vi or Belmont. We want to age in place. Have the needs of seniors been acknowledged/respected in this process? It mostly impacts the transportation issue and lack of provision for the type of transportation that seniors need.
 - AW: I'll summarize by suggesting that we ensure planning takes account of all age groups and that planning includes mobility by automobile.

- Bill Beck: I live in north UC, so when the committee makes its suggestions to the city, they're just that – suggestions? They don't have to obey/follow the suggestions? With all the ideas floated including bike lanes/pathways - where is the money coming from? I don't understand. Over the next 30 years, how does the city expect to pay for these grandiose but good ideas? I've been trying to get 3 streetlights for 9 years from the city.
 - AW: Yes, the UCPG Subcommittee makes a recommendation to the UCPG which makes a recommendation to the city. I'll restate your comment and that it is about implementation – we need to plan for implementation that will provide for the facilities we will need in the future. Maybe the city can consider prioritizing a list for the community plan that includes absolutely needed improvements and be sure those get done first? The way city pays for infrastructure is that development takes place first, infrastructure gets updated sometimes in piecemeal way, or larger sources of funding help supplement and pay for larger infrastructure projects.
- Charlie Fraser: Resident and property owner in UC for 47 years. I read the plan with great interest and I applaud it with a vision and land use framework for the statement that we should have property for all ages. I do have this against the plan – throughout, it assumes that driving equates to greenhouse gas emissions and that ignores Electric Vehicles. That's a major hole in the planning assumptions that needs to be addressed. There is also age and disability discrimination in priority #5 "Reduce stress on cyclists – reducing the Stress on Cyclists: Bicycle lanes paired with a designated buffer space separating the bicycle lane from the adjacent motor vehicle travel greatly reduces stress on cyclists. With many destinations in the community within cycling distance, making it easier for people to cycle improves mobility for everyone, even people unable to cycle." The community planning subcommittee scenario, figure 3 page 31 – La Jolla Community Church, my church, and good Samaritan are shown as Urban Village 0-146 du/ac. I'd like to note that the church did try to develop housing a few years ago and there is a covenant in the deed/title that says it has to be approved by all other property owners - which they wouldn't do. I heard that one of the people who put up a 4-story building had to pay \$1M to other landowners to be able to do that, Will this plan nullify those covenants, and if no, why not show as institutional the places of worship on page 88? On page 89, the picture that illustrates a complete street has no handicapped parking on that street nor is it addressed anywhere in the plan. On page 99, active transportation, walking and bicycling, is the clearest mobility option that lessens air pollution and makes for a healthy environment as people traveling by human power speeds shop at local places. Again, this involves age and disability discrimination.
 - AW: The land use designation would not change any covenant. To sharpen your comments, I might suggest that the plan assumes automotive uses by gas powered auto, but EVs didn't seem to appear at the same level of detail, so that should be part of our mobility planning. The complete street diagrams take a long slice across the street and might not be at a point with handicapped parking, but the comment is noted that handicapped parking should be planned.
- Linda Beresford: A long-time resident of UC, I have made comments before, will make them again because I've made these comments before and probably 100s of others

made these comments but there has been almost no change from scenario A to city's preferred scenario with exception of increasing housing. The Vons/Sprouts on Governor Drive is zoned for 29 du/ac. The City proposal goes up to 73 du/ac, it should be reduced and maintained at 29du/ac. There should be no reduction of lanes on Governor Drive. There's an assumption that there would be an increase in busing but given the national shortage of bus drivers and MTS budget, buses are unlikely. Mini-mobility hubs are not likely to be built since it's very unlikely that the city will have the budget to install any of them. For all of the commercial units there is language in the plan that says retain commercial services "if feasible or if possible" and that they should consider unbundled parking. For all locations that have commercial services – grocery, pharmacy, etc., we need to *require* those services be retained if they are going to provide housing. I'm not sure when zoning gets incorporated, but it needs to be a requirement, not just "if feasible". We need to have onsite parking both for commercial services and for people to live there. We need to go back to a smaller increase in housing. I can't say specific locations, though there are many locations that go up to north of 200 du/ac; our comments recommended a limit of 140 units/ac since there is no ability to add significant parks. Pocket parks/plazas are not an increase of parks. I've asked the City if anyone else uses the point system for parks as in our master plan and did not get a response. We do not have police services to support this. I also suggest 140 du/ac because these numbers do not seem to account for ADUs and the increase in housing the city hopes to get when it adopts SB10 in its Housing Action Plan 2.0 package. We need to include a percentage that requires affordable housing; off-site credits don't work. If they build, we have to build affordable housing – we have a crisis, so let's build the housing we say we need.

- AW: With unbundled parking, instead of providing free parking as part of rent, renters might pay less if they don't receive a parking space.
 - Linda Beresford: But then they park on the street.
 - AW: This is a plan for land use/mobility, it is not implementation of the plan. There is often a disconnect on what city promises and can deliver.
- Admiral Hekman: My grandsons are in their 20s, but where are the schools? We want to add 30,000 residents but where are the schools? There's nothing in the plan. Europe's average home size is less than 700 sf. They have subways, but the birthrate of their school children is 0.7. You need 2.2 to stay even in population. You don't raise children in 700 sf. This doesn't do anything for the population, for our families.
 - AW: Consensus from subcommittee is for the city to coordinate/communicate with city schools. Page 160 discusses that, but I think it would be valuable to enhance that paragraph and note that communication should be transparent.
- DK: Need to ensure there are places for families, where people who have kids have housing that is affordable and has 2-3-bedroom apartments not just studios/1bedrooms.
- Jen Dunaway: I am a civil engineer by trade and looked at Governor Drive and asked the City for the traffic count survey and would like to see the data to analyze it. I can't see, as a civil engineer, how it would justify one lane. It should be 2 lanes. Governor Drive

should have 2 lanes in each direction. For infrastructure, we have limited land and roads - where is storage for cars and fire egress? How is that going to happen? All of SD is in fire zone, not good for fire planning for evacuation. You should talk to the fire department to find out what the evacuation plan is. For Sprouts/Vons – add to what Linda said – looking at data. Where did plans come from to add housing at Sprouts and Vons? It's not in a TPA. How is this justified? Those proposals should be knocked out of the plan.

- Nicole Lily: Resident of UC, I've heard that updating a community plan is emotional and that we should expect to disagree. I'm here despite the disregard and disrespect for young residents. It's emotional for us as well, and it directly affects ourselves and generation to come. At every meeting, youth and pro-housing people have been disrespected. We've heard you and we hope you can accept us as residents as well. I support the highest density scenario because it is my community too and I am welcoming neighbors, regardless of whether or not we plan for them. I don't want to have to live in an inexpensive rundown apartment in college and I want a better future for myself and all ages that will follow me. Adding high density near transit is essential for creating a better tomorrow. We need to plan for high density development and essential mobility for the following years and decades because this plan won't be adopted and implemented overnight. I hope there can be a future without a rent burdened run-down apartment with too many roommates. This will not undo the hard work to own your home and does not require you to ride a bicycle– these arguments are disingenuous.

- Subcommittee Comments:

- KR: I'd like to talk about the maps, specifically some errors: you are missing Scripps Hospital, missing UCSD hospital, missing Torrey Pines City Park, missing East Gate Mini Park, Eastgate Park #2. Institutional stuff at the off ramp at 805 - not sure why that is there? One is a park and ride; I'm wondering why block is very high density 74-109 du/ac, higher than the height limit – that doesn't make sense. Parcel in south UC is shown as open space but it is zoned as a golf course (Avia). Behind "Dinosaur Park" is shown as institutional? Should it be a utility land use, since it is owned by the Water Department, or open space? The area near Regents marked as open space and was previously looked to for development – do they lose their rights? In lieu fees (170 1.1D), you should change "encourage" to "require" affordable housing. 170.1.1F, stacked flats with no stairs, how is fire egress going to happen with multistory with no stairs. I encourage requiring similar use for commercial and add houses of worship to list that should be marked as institutional. On page 174 2.9A/D pick one – short side or wide side going towards the canyon. 174.2.1 parking – should require a flat plate design so if cars do go away, you can repurpose the parking garage to another use. 175.2.1.9.a remove "where feasible".
 - AW: Default for houses of worship should be institutional. The city is doing their best to properly categorize land use plan, and there have been conversations with some congregations to reflect appropriately what they'd like to be

designated as. Committee might suggest that the city make sure. The default preference for houses of worship should be institutional unless they've discussed their preference with the City.

- GL: Some churches would like to do low/moderate income housing; institutional may diminish the opportunity.
 - KR: Institutional can include housing
 - AW: Default should be institutional, unless otherwise requested by the congregation themselves.
 - GL: Churches have been known to sell property, with churches moving away from congregations. I'm not sure some religious institutions can make it over the next decades.
 - AW: The flip side of that is we don't want to inappropriately zone them to make it unaffordable to stay. Default should be institutional, unless otherwise provided for by the congregation themselves.
 - NG: We are required to treat them equally to their neighbors, We can put them as institutional, it makes no difference, they would get same zoning as their neighbors and would be able to develop per their zoning.
- AW: I've pushed for affordable housing and asked for a specific inclusionary requirement in UC, expressed concerns about displacement, and community serving retail displacement. There are certain areas where these issues come together like the Sprouts/Vons plazas. There are specific concerns that many have shared re south UC plazas, including that community serving retail and other services are preserved. They should be protected through zoning or with stronger supplemental development regulations. We should also consider adequate parking and avoid impacts on adjacent properties. I suggest that housing be focused on Governor/Regents or Genesee as opposed to adjacent low rise neighbors. Those plazas could also include step backs and setbacks to guarantee greater separation of development. Is there opposition to any of those items?
 - GL: Agree with idea of retaining community serving retail, concern is we get too specific for what we require. Times are changing, maybe 10-15 years now retailing will be online or by delivery and someone can't support a supermarket there. Need to build in that flexibility. Agree there should be community serving, but it would be even better for that use if there is residential. I would like to see some emphasis on better integration between owners so you don't have to drive to get to the retail. There should be pathways for walking.

- AW: Yes to improved circulation and flexibility, do we have a consensus? are there any other objections?
 - JS: Not an objection, an expansion, for the concept of community serving retail – looking at south UC you have community serving small operators, a doctor or dentist who cannot afford to move into high rise, and community serving retail is controlled by rents. When we talk about community serving retail should also include services. [AW: Yes]
 - LP: This conversation is about protecting community serving retail in south UC. Unfortunately, this plan began with distributed model for high density and I understand the south UC single family pushing back on high density in neighborhoods, but the result is we have high density in North UC. We don't hear the same language for protection in North UC. We are putting more than 50K people there and we have 2 grocery stores – that can't serve that size of community – not only do we need to preserve it, but we need to insist development includes additional retail, grocery, and pharmacy.
 - AW: I have NUC on my agenda next.
- AW: I'm declaring consensus on that package of policy and suggestions.
- AW: So now the question in South UC is how much density? Currently, the proposal in Scenario A includes the potential of up to 73 du/ac or approximately 500 units in each plaza. The current zoning is 29 du/ac or a max of 210 units. We want to know what people think? I will start. Personally – I think the Vons parcel is an appropriate place for that many housing units, but I don't think the same is true for Sprouts. South UC is less expensive than north on a land value basis. If we don't want a future community made up of apartments with 4500/mo. rents, we should start with generosity in South UC for some of those new residents. I don't think a max of 500 is too many at Vons. Assuming all that other protections that we've just talked about are in place. Sprouts is different because it is not on a reasonable transit line. It's also configured differently and adjacent to single family houses. Sprouts should have a lower density, more than 29/ac but less than 73 du/ac.
 - Public: What would heights be?
 - AW: Should be a height limit as we don't want towers.
 - Public: Where in the shopping center would the proposed housing be?
 - AW: Up on top of the retail.
 - Public: How tall would that allow?
 - NG: The height limit is 100'
 - AW: I support a lower height limit
 - Public: 0-73 depends on structures 4-7 stories to achieve that density. It depends on the

size of buildings, it's not 3 stories, it's considerably higher.

- Public: Are you representing us? Or do you just decide yourselves? Why 40% of all housing that the city wants is for us? Why are we targeted? I don't think we're being listened to? Let's take a poll. Are you representing us?
 - AW: I want us to have a conversation, see where other people are.
- PK: I thank you for bringing that up. That was my question when I got to the end. The city is going to go with an alternative recommended by the staff, not what the community recommended, based on meeting goals better and taking into account input of other stakeholders. I would like to see how does it meets those goals and who are the other stakeholders being listened to when we are not?
- DiM: Address the issue with listening and who gets a say. I've been doing this for 5 years, and I absolutely listen to what you all say. Being heard is not the same thing as getting our way. I'm thankful that the current plan took account of me before I lived here. We have to give some thought to who will live here after us. Comments on Sprouts are appropriate, less suited for towers but higher density at Vons.
- JS: I live in north UC. I don't have a perspective on yes or no on what you're proposing, but some sounds reasonable if we're going to have to increase housing. I can't visualize how this will work, Is it because Governor Dr. is so messed up? If we had a clearer idea of how Governor Dr. will look, we might be able to tackle the issue you're talking about – but to me it's tied up with transit.
- AL: I don't feel that I have enough perspective to comment on Sprouts but we should be pushing for as much mixed use as possible I agree with Vons because it already is connected on bus lines. All of us should be pushing for better public transportation. People have been talking about relying on transit so we should collectively push for better transit.
- Jeff Dosick: I agree with you on Governor. I've been a bike commuter. On Governor west of Genesee there used to be bike lanes and now they're gone. Talking about density, where's the mobility element? The plan shows beautiful pictures, taken from city transportation officials of how to have urban planning, but why doesn't it follow through? We were told by the trolley that they would make bike lanes equal or better than what existed. There was a continuous bike lane, and it's not there anymore. What is on Genesee is so unsafe with traffic turning right crossing where bikers travel. Cars must slow down and there need to be turnouts. The city needs to follow Vision Zero guidelines and not just cherry pick and make cars the primary purpose. If cars make right hand turns, they have to slow up and not go 45 mph. The city doesn't seem to be listening in UC.
 - AW: Sounds like there isn't a consensus on the idea I floated on densities.
 - Public: We heard consensus for your idea. I appreciate what you said about the possibility of being willing to consider lesser density in one shopping center [in south UC] than the other is wonderful. I didn't hear that you didn't have consensus.

- Public: The dialogue going forward was an improvement in the discussion over the past many months. Early on there was a statement that SB9 or other initiatives increase density throughout the city, but if we're looking at how to get X units out of this community, it makes no sense. Why are we not looking at how many units we're getting from SB 9 or the housing action plan? If anyone has read it – the number of units is astronomical. Up to 10 units plus 4 additional units if you have some affordability in a single family residential zoned neighborhood. It is ridiculous not to be looking at those numbers when we adjust the community plan. We are ignoring ongoing development and we have multiple development initiatives ongoing. We are ignoring parks – the plan should be specific that for property purchased in north UC, no parks are being proposed to add there, not even a little strip of grass, something where kids can play a soccer game or baseball game. Those moving into north UC will have a miserable life to get out of their apartment to get into some green. They deserve a park.
- AW: we must talk about the north and we haven't talked about mobility yet. North of Rose Canyon is Nobel Square, the two plazas with Whole Foods, Trader Joes and Ralphs. It is contemplated to be mixed use and goes beyond the coastal height limit. This would require city voter's approval, but the plan is planned to be above the height limit. The proposal is for mixed use and to allow housing at high density and retail and other commercial uses. I'll state what might be consensus. The area is totally appropriate to lift the coastal height limit, but not to do away with a limit altogether. A lobbyist for the owner of one plaza says 85' is desirable, so let's set that. This is the right place to preserve and expand community and regional retail in the north and also to expand housing. It is an ideal site for the campus to partner for housing that is affordable to students. But the area is not appropriate for mixed use zoning, which will put retail and housing into competition with higher value commercial use. We need to protect retail and housing for a growing population, rather than set them up for displacement by bio-tech/high tech, etc. This area is appropriate for residents/retail, whereas other areas are appropriate for biotech/high tech. It should be zoned community village for retail and residents. It should also have the same setback-step back protections for edges for adjacent condominiums.
 - DK: Point out that the area is not just those shopping centers, includes Sheraton and buildings along La Jolla Village Drive it's a large area and includes areas west of Villa La Jolla. I feel strongly that there is no park space over there – zero – it's nowhere near Doyle Park, and if a lot of added density is added there needs to be significant park there. I feel extremely strongly that that is the area that needs significant park space - big enough to kick a soccer ball around on.
 - JS: Like the idea, AW, in favor of lifting height limit, if residential included in there. I also suggest putting a pedestrian bridge between

Whole Foods and Ralphs and across Villa La Jolla to get between new UCSD extension building and the gas station. Street parking becomes very important with this density increase. You can't have it all, and the city needs to look at removing street parking on Villa La Jolla and on a large portion of Nobel. This adds to safety for transportation on both roads.

- GL: It is important to allow hotel use because there is an existing hotel. The code doesn't require parking for housing – I wouldn't develop without any parking but that's what the city rules are. This is designated as one of two regional shopping centers, with the density at UTC more than doubled even before we started talking about a plan update, people that own property in the Nobel Square area have a right to go back to city and say you allowed a doubling of density so I want my fair share. Wholeheartedly agree with AW but suggest density should be higher than the proposed plan since it's adjacent to public transportation, adjacent to UCSD, eliminates the 30' height. Density should be over 100'.
- PK: Wholeheartedly support increasing height, but when they talk about density, they assume whole area built up, so why not do 14 stories on ½ the site allowing for park to be built. Increasing the height of some buildings would open up areas for community spaces, etc.
- KR: I like PK's idea of carving out space for park by having another building higher. Encourage smaller units as well as 3-bedroom, might have single person apartments since it's near UCD.
- AL: I agree that we should retain community serving businesses, especially grocery stores and would agree with having density/height, but I am worried about the community village designation because there are doctor/psychologist offices and I am not sure if that would make those uses possible. Right next to trolley close to UCSD so more density/height makes sense here.
 - KR: But not all biotech.
- LP: West of La Jolla Village Square there are a lot of two-story town homes, if you put 7 stories adjacent, it will remove sunlight and will make them unpleasant to own/live in. Area on Gilman and La Jolla Village Drive is designated high density – that corner of UCSD just put 5 new large buildings there, and you look up and see those buildings hanging over single family homes, which is challenging for the neighborhood. I'm OK with putting residential housing at shopping center but you can't remove the parking as people come to those regional centers. Need to make sure we retain parking for shopping centers and don't impose upon residential neighborhoods where parking has been there for a long time. Parking for buildings going in on the UCSD campus is an issue and as you add density in UTC and Torrey Pines, you have La Jolla Village Drive and La Jolla Scenic that is going to

be a real traffic mess. Parking has always been a bit of a problem but as UCSD has built up and precluded first year students from having cars on campus, they park in residential neighborhoods.

○ AW:

- Summary: I hope this is the kind of conversation we can have next month and the following month. But we need more time, so we'll find out how to make that possible. We heard a lot of ideas and agreement. My initial idea was just restricted to those two plazas at Nobel, but we did hear consensus to use zoning to protect retail/housing, ensure sufficient parking, pedestrian/ bike safety, use pedestrian bridges. Park space needs thorough discussion, hotel uses are maybe best where they are now. Adjacency protections matter, as do setbacks, and development can be denser on the right parts of this site as has been done in many places.

8:02 Adjournment