

17:54:07 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Can anyone hear anything

17:54:34 From Planning Department City of San Diego to Everyone:

Hello Linda - The meeting will start at 6pm. We will announce when we are getting started.

17:54:37 From Katie Rodolico to Everyone:

I don't think anyone is talking right now, Linda

17:54:46 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Thank you

18:04:25 From David Broide to Everyone:

I would like to ask a non-agenda item

18:06:06 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

This is Linda Beresford. I would also like to speak during non-agenda comment time.

18:06:28 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

This is Jen Dunaway. I would like to speak during the non agenda comment time.

18:06:38 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

I would like to do non-agenda public comment.

18:06:43 From Suzy Shamsky to Everyone:

I would like to do a non agenda public comment.

18:06:44 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

Debby Knight

18:06:51 From Tom Mullaney to Everyone:

Non agenda comment. Tom Mullaney

18:06:51 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Diane Ahern - Public comment please

18:07:07 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

Non-agenda public comment please

18:07:12 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

This is Bonnie Kutch and I'd like to make comments during non-agenda items please.

18:07:27 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

Tom Hekman here, I would like to hear an update on the proposed Governor Drive lane reduction status and updated traffic study.

18:07:53 From Jennifer Martin-Roff to Everyone:

Non-agenda public comment please

18:16:03 From David Broide to Everyone:

I was the number 1 individual who asked to speak on non-agenda items

18:16:12 From David Broide to Everyone:

David Broide

18:17:18 From Andrew Wiese to Everyone:

some speakers requested to speak prior to the meeting start.

18:18:06 From Angie Jones to Everyone:

The list of people who requested to talk has disappeared from the chat.

18:18:30 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Requesting again to speak during non agenda item. Jen Dunaway

18:19:02 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Hi Andy, Jemma will provide update on the UC Celebration.

18:20:08 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

University City Community Association - UCCA - website at
<https://www.universitycitynews.org/>

Newsletter - contact Us at UniversityCityNew@gmail.com

4th of July UC Celebration - info at <http://uccelebration.com/>

18:22:48 From Andrew Wiese to Everyone:

If you wish to make non agenda public comment, please note your request in the chat.

18:24:53 From Rebecca Robinson Wood to Everyone:

I request to make public comment.

18:25:49 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

Laurie Phillips is in the meeting

18:26:46 From Laura Valera-Guallar to Everyone:

I request to make a non agenda public comment

18:28:25 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

1. Linda of Save UC did a thorough presentation in May's meeting outlining the significant flaws with the City's Planning Process and results on the UC Plan Update and how it should be redone in terms of survey, premise, options and proposals. What is the City's response? We are still waiting. Proceeding on like it didn't happen is not an option for this community. These meetings need to actually address the community concerns and comments vice ignoring the input at these meetings.

18:28:28 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

University City Community Association - UCCA - website at
<https://www.universitycitynews.org/>

Newsletter - contact Us at UniversityCityNew@gmail.com

4th of July UC Celebration - info at <http://uccelebration.com/>

Jemma Samala at jemmasamala@gmail.com

18:31:50 From Tom Mullaney to Everyone:

"Build a Better Slush Fund"

Transferring Impact Fees out of your community

Tom Mullaney

LivableSanDiego@gmail.com

619-889-5626

18:32:58 From Garret Ashman (owner, parent, 6th & 9th) to Everyone:

I request to make a non agenda public comment.

18:34:59 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Check out the Standley Aquatic Center on Governor Drive at

<https://www.sandiego.gov/pools/standley-aquatic-center>

18:35:57 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Agreed with speaker on revising scenarios based on overwhelming community feedback from May 2022.

18:36:21 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Thanks to all for the pertinent comments.

18:37:24 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

City has not provided metrics or hard data to support why UC's community needs to bear this requirement for density after the major increases since 1987's plan.

18:41:33 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Information about Park Social and the exhibit at Standley Park - Tribute to Palesteros - <https://www.sandiego.gov/park-social>

18:44:17 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

When are we going to have a meeting when the community input from May and today are discussed in detail so that the direction of this Plan Update can change?

18:44:42 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

The community wants to find reasonable ground and meaningful input in this process. We have asked many questions, can the City please start providing answers? We need to know proposed height limits, how will parking be handled, how will commercial services be retained? Perhaps most importantly, why is the City proposing so much density beyond population growth projections? If it is because you want a certain yield, what is the metric used? Will the Land Use Scenarios ever change based on the input the City has received so far?

18:45:33 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Suggest at the next meeting, City needs to request items for Agenda so the community can drive the actual agenda. PLEASE.

18:46:38 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

We do have "other ideas" and have been providing them to you for the last two months.

18:47:35 From Karen Arden to Everyone:

Who sets the agenda? Can that we request an agenda item for the next meeting for feedback from the City related to community input?

18:49:37 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

It's obvious the city is going forward with more density rather we want it or not. We don't need incentives if they're not increasing density. They're ignoring everything that has been said during the past meetings.

18:49:47 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Why are you driving the agenda to instruct us to discuss incentives when it is obvious that the community has other pressing concerns and issues?

18:49:50 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Is the only way to receive public benefits through private development??

18:50:12 From Tom Ruff to Everyone:

Are the incentives for the developer or the community?

18:50:56 From Garret Ashman (owner, parent, 6th & 9th) to Everyone:

I agree with Eric & Jennifer 🙏🙏🙏

18:50:58 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Who decided on this agenda today? Why?

18:51:07 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

This agenda is discussing incentives beyond base densities. The problem is that this assumes we have already agreed upon a base density. How can we possibly discuss incentives to increase density when we are nowhere near agreement on what the base density should be.

18:51:33 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Any very full of concrete!

18:51:39 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

And

18:51:57 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

The developers get the incentive, not the community.

18:52:00 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

Selecting "incentives" is rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. We

question and oppose the UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION that this level of FAR increase is required

18:52:13 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

The Horton Plaza park is an example of exactly of what is problematic: the developer has currently closed it off to accommodate further construction.

18:52:18 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Property owner or developer?

18:52:42 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Again, Nancy, who decided on this agenda and why. Were you not at the meeting from May and heard from the community on what we would like to discuss and get answers on?

18:53:20 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

If we wanted to live in high density we would have moved downtown but we didn't. They aren't listening to us and letting us talk about plans to destroy the Sprouts and Vons retail areas.

18:53:28 From David Broide to Everyone:

Hi Nancy Graham, We first need to discuss baseline density the city proposes before discussing bonus density. You have not heard how concerned the residents of University City are about the increased baseline density. Please focus future discussions on addressing baseline density questions and concerns

18:53:32 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

How do you ensure that an eco-roof is sustained in perpetuity???

18:53:33 From David Broide to Everyone:

David Broide

18:53:47 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Where are the people using the eco roof?

18:53:55 From Joann Selleck to Everyone:

Why would a private property owner agree to maintain a public park? Public has no recourse if private owner does not maintain. Huge liability for private owner as well. What am I missing.

18:54:03 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

How are eco roofs watered during the 8 plus months of the year when there is no rain?

18:54:05 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Nancy, suggest the break out rooms prioritize the top 3 issues facing the community with this draft Plan Update.

18:54:23 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

This discussion seems like a complete distraction to community concerns

18:54:28 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

Why should we consider any of this when the city is not listening to our community?

18:54:40 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

I agree with Linda Beresford, this discussion is not addressing the base density issue. Why is no one addressing all of our concerns that we've spent so much time asking

18:54:49 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

So to have a grocery store we have to give in to high density?

18:54:51 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Why don't we zone areas for grocery stores?

18:55:23 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

The last thing we want is more housing as an incentive to keep our grocery stores

18:55:24 From Joann Selleck to Everyone:

If our plan contains incentives we want, what is the mechanism to "guarantee" that they will be followed and implemented by the city (or even relevant) 20 years in the future?

18:55:52 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

My top 3: 1) Draft scenarios are flawed and need to be redone. 2) City needs to explain why UC needs to absorb 61K-81K in density and where that came from, 3) community input needs to be recorded, questions answered and documented.

18:56:12 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

So based on this where you are saying that we have to give an incentive to get a grocery store, then the base density should start very low. Then there can be an incentive for a grocery store for a reasonable density. Same concept applies for parking.

18:56:19 From Karen Arden to Everyone:

Well said Jennifer!

18:56:32 From Garret Ashman (owner, parent, 6th & 9th) to Everyone:

If we insist on grocery stores, then developers are less likely to increase density? Sounds good to me! 👍😊

18:56:43 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Suggest everyone who goes into break out rooms come up with your top 3 concerns.

18:56:44 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

Thank you Jennifer. All should be addressed before discussing incentives.

18:57:08 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

If we don't want high buildings why would we want 5 story garages?

18:57:52 From David Broide to Everyone:

We should not let Nancy distract us with bonus density when baseline density increase in the plan is already a significant bonus from the current plan

18:57:52 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

Once again they are dictating the narrative and forcing us to talk about their high density plan and not what we want to talk about and get answers to our questions. That's what should be discussed in the breakout sessions.

18:57:57 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Who controls the funds for enhancements?

18:57:58 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:

Very little of this really pertains to UC neighborhood both N. or S.

18:58:10 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

yes to Jennifer Dunaway's top 3. I hope the city hears this

18:58:12 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

City Planners would like us to acquiesce and discuss the incentives in the break out rooms. Don't. Discuss your top 3 concerns.

18:58:17 From Dima Zemsky to Everyone:

Multiple people have asked about parking and inclusion of garages in updated proposals for shopping centers.

18:58:47 From barbara gellman to Everyone:

Why do you think they are doing that, hoping we will forget the issue?

18:58:52 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

Agreed. We refuse to talk about incentives because no underlying

explanation for increased density has ever been explained

18:59:05 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Who is getting these bonuses? The builders!

18:59:50 From Joann Selleck to Everyone:

What can we do as shade alternatives to trees since we are quickly running into a situation where there will be no water to water trees?

18:59:56 From Garret Ashman (owner, parent, 6th & 9th) to Everyone:

I agree with Paul. 👍

19:01:27 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

Basically this is a long list things developers can do to be allowed to build at higher density

19:02:08 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

This does not provide any resident benefit. Don't discuss incentives until the City actually will entertain our concerns. They are ignoring the elephant in the room.

19:02:11 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Agree With Thomas and Paul.

19:02:24 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Sounds like the incentive is for deciphers to build more and higher. I thought this was going to be about incentives for the community

19:02:34 From Kelsey Feinstein to Everyone:

Calling more density a bonus is not a bonus

19:02:37 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

wasting time with the downtown mumbo-jumbo. id rather see this time used to answer the abundance of pending questions put forth by the UC residents.

19:02:39 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

This presentation is offensive. It posits that density and FAR will greatly increase, REGARDLESS of community opposition and WITHOUT any justification or metrics whatsoever. THEN it asks how we want it packaged. Like passing sentence without trial, and then offering a choice of executions.

19:03:31 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Compare us to Serra Mesa, Scripps Ranch, Carmel Valley, Tierrasanta. What about those vice the Urban areas mentioned here? Clueless.

19:03:33 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Before all of these incentives, we the community need to have a good plan so that this sort of piecemeal amenity creation doesn't result in a patchwork...such as we see in the current bike infrastructure (one block of a bike lane, the next none...)

19:03:45 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:

Agree with Anita Wilson!

19:03:47 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

We should not have to agree to higher / bonus density to keep current amenities. We need to reduce the base density numbers proposed by the City before we can discuss these issues.

19:04:07 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Agree with people making statements in chats.

19:04:10 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:

True Linda Beresford!

19:04:12 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

Yes, Paul Goldstein. This is so offensive!

19:04:35 From Kelsey Feinstein to Everyone:
UC has already increased density with all of the condos behind UTC and the new towers.

19:04:42 From David Rideout to Everyone:
agree with Isabelle Kay

19:05:35 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:
Great. I hate this. Let's not do this at all

19:05:55 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:
Sounds like the bonus is to the developer.

19:05:58 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:
Agree Linda!

19:06:10 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:
Incentives could work, but we need to start at a reasonable baseline!

19:06:11 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:
When did you hear this? Not at the last meeting.

19:06:20 From Am L to Everyone:
We do not want this. End of story

19:06:22 From Karen Arden to Everyone:
We don't have a land use plan yet - how can we discuss incentives?

19:06:29 From Carole Pietras to Everyone:
I don't want to do this. We are not downtown!

19:06:44 From Katie Rodolico to Everyone:
Linda Beresford just nailed it. Without knowing the baseline, this is unreasonable.

19:06:46 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:
Still have no idea where she heard this was needed to discuss. ?

19:06:51 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:
I agree with Linda B

19:07:02 From Carole Pietras to Everyone:
This is a waste of time. Carole Pietras

19:07:24 From Linda Levy to Everyone:
I think there is agreement, without going into breakouts, that this is not appropriate. You are missing the point that there is still not support for increasing density. You may need the data to show someone else above you m however it is an insult to this community.

19:07:46 From barbara gellman to Everyone:
Why aren't we discussing University City, that's what we are here to do>

19:08:22 From William Batista to Everyone:
Can we take a poll over Zoom to see how many participants tonight want to do these breakouts? I think most would rather focus on addressing the questions that were asked in May.

19:08:46 From Linda Levy to Everyone:
Agree with William.

19:08:53 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:
William right on

19:09:01 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:
Yes William I do not support the increase of density. please poll so I don't have to waste my time in a breakout room

19:09:05 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:
Agree with William.

19:09:06 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

We don't want more density. Period.

19:09:10 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

Yes William!

19:09:15 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

What if we reduce the densities first, then we can talk about ADDING density bonuses?

19:09:18 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

Agree with William

19:09:33 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Nancy is not listening or comprehending that UC does not want the density that is being pushed on the community.

19:09:47 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

They need to first justify the basis for their density requirements

19:09:48 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Why was UC's plan chosen to be updated vice the many others that are older? Why is the premise that we have to increase density when our plan has been amended 7 times increasing density since 1987. City Planners need to answer the questions.

19:09:56 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

The order of operations is the problem. The first discussion needs to be justifying density. This is urgent, this is critical, and this has not happened.

Talking about tradeoffs for amenities is a long way down the line.

19:10:14 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Agree with Paul

19:10:15 From Diana Meisenholder to Everyone:

Big Picture: No increased density in UC

19:10:17 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Agreed with Paul.

19:10:23 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Agree with Paul

19:10:33 From Katerina Semendeferi to Everyone:

Paul is right. FIRST, WHY DO WE NEED MORE DENSITY?

19:10:54 From Am L to Everyone:

We don't want density, no matter the carrots being dangled. Leave us alone

19:11:05 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

We have already increased density since 1987 compared to other communities. Five fold. UC has done its fair share. Why are we having this discussion?

19:11:05 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

They are still trying to turn us into little italy

19:11:26 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

Can we give nothing until we decide what is the appropriate growth rate?

19:11:30 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

ok we ask for zero increased density in south uc?

19:11:34 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Again, why are we having this discussion?

19:11:37 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

It is very challenging to be discussing our preferences related to these things when we don't know what levels of upzoning we are talking about. Like eco roof gets you one more unit or 10 floors?

19:11:48 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:

More density is not a bonus. Trolley was to allow more people to live in different parts of the city.

19:11:57 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Nancy. Please start from the beginning Let's revise the whole community plan with community input

19:11:58 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

Everything was missed in the original Land Use Scenarios.

19:12:23 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

La Jolla Cross roads, Renaissance, - there are thousands of units that have been added to UC since 1987. Why force UC to absorb yet more?

19:12:32 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

So that means we do not grow in South UC but only in North UC? Once again they are trying to divide and conquer us.

19:12:43 From Carole Pietras to Everyone:

A bonus program could be discussed later. Not now. Carole Pietras

19:12:54 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

This is an academic exercise

19:13:00 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

They need to justify the densities not use them as a foundation from which to roll back

19:13:16 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Why?

19:14:28 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

How many housing units have been added to Serra Mesa, Tierrasanta, Del Cerro, Allied Gardens, Rolando, etc since 1987 compared to UC.

19:14:49 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Yes Jennifer...and those developments have no reasonably accessible public transit or bike routes to support them, no open space added to compensate our community for the huge increase in people. The city is NOT CAPABLE of increasing density and keeping our community livable.

19:14:51 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

What FAR are you suggesting? We don't even know what you want us to negotiate from with so-called incentives and bonuses.

19:14:55 From Marion Nebiker to Everyone:

I don't think any new plan should be discussed until all our questions are answered!

19:14:58 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

AS far as I know the developers are just paying money and then doing nothing.

19:15:03 From Garret Ashman (owner, parent, 6th & 9th) to Everyone:

In the breakout rooms we will organize how to fight this entire proposal since the city won't give us any answers. We'll discuss who can make signs, when & where to protest,, and who can do media, etc... We have simple questions, yet no answers.

19:15:29 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

I don't understand. Why are we talking density if we're not increasing density. It's obvious the city is ignoring us and will be increasing density?

19:15:47 From Kelsey Feinstein to Everyone:

How can we possibly talk about incentives when we still don't have a detailed plan of exactly what they want?

19:15:58 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

I have a question but can't figure out how to raise my hand

19:16:08 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

As I said earlier, we had many questions from May 2022. None of those answers have been answered. Nancy stated some of the answers would be in her "incentive" presentation. This has not happened.

19:16:11 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

We...Hate...This!!!

19:16:21 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

Move forward in what directions?

19:16:33 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Linda L.: I believe that if the developers pay \$\$, they are then off the hook. How that \$\$ is spent is a good question.

19:16:42 From Adam Lubliner to Everyone:

People dislike this plan for many reasons.

19:16:55 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

Why would she go back to the plan we are heavily in opposition of.....

19:17:15 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

Does the Bonus plan have controls for specific projects or once in place could a developer exercise their option if there are other issues such as traffic with their proposal?

19:17:21 From William Batista to Everyone:

The problem is that the numbers in the original two plans are not justified by the data.

19:17:27 From Kelsey Feinstein to Everyone:

WE aren't downtown!!!!

19:17:33 From Joshua Jones to Everyone:

San Diego is going down dangerous paths if you are a homeowner:

April 11, 2022 - San Diego gave developers a new incentive Monday to build more accessory dwelling units for low-income people.

<https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/politics/story/2022-04-11/san-diego-adds-new-incentive-to-spur-more-low-income-granny-flat-adu>

June 15, 2022 - State opens door to apartment buildings over 30 feet in San Diego's coastal zone

<https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/growth-development/story/2022-06-15/s-tate-opens-door-to-apartment-buildings-over-30-feet-in-san-diegos-coastal-zone>

Great paths to follow if you are a developer!

19:17:34 From William Batista to Everyone:

We don't want to be downtown.

19:17:37 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Can Nancy explain why there are expected densities in our area?

19:17:39 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Nancy, you are not new. You heard us in May. We are not downtown. Linda of Save UC did a thorough presentation in May's meeting outlining the significant flaws with the City's Planning Process and results on the UC Plan Update and how it

should be redone in terms of survey, premise, options and proposals. What is the City's response? We are still waiting. Proceeding on like it didn't happen is not an option. We are still waiting.

19:17:39 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

We do not want to be an extension of downtown

19:18:05 From Marion Nebiker to Everyone:

There are about 100 people on this Zoom. That is not representative of the entire community. Many couldn't be on this meeting and their concerns should be heard and considered.

19:18:19 From Linda Levy to Everyone:

Nancy you have listened to questions but you and the city are not answering the MANY questions that this group has had since May and again tonight.

19:18:41 From Veronica Ayesta to Everyone:

also there is a relationship between FAR and zoning correct?

19:18:57 From Carole Pietras to Everyone:

Is she talking about North UC and South UC ?

19:19:01 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

The city has already TAKEN from the community by allowing HUGE increases in density already with ZERO addition of public parks.

19:19:40 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

So basically we are just nego

19:19:49 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Thousands of units have been added in North UC since 1987. Very little public amenities have been added to support those households.

19:19:55 From Dianna Barrantes-Greer to Everyone:

Negotiating what we do not want

19:20:15 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

We don't want NUANCE; we want NO MORE high density housing. And we want our parkland and open space and bike lanes...

19:20:45 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Equitable growth in the City of San Diego.

19:22:03 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

She continues to talk about increased densities.

19:22:06 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

We want to talk about what we discussed in May 2022. We want to go back to why are we even discussing the rationale behind any increase in density.

19:22:16 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Let US develop the land use plan, including the base densities and THEN we can talk about incentives for developers. This town is run by developers...

19:22:18 From William Batista to Everyone:

Has there been a response to the question concerning the validity of the growth projections underlying the existing plans?

19:23:00 From Dinesh Martien to Everyone:

If you need to reference what the city has presented, here are two links:

https://www.planuniversity.org/_files/ugd/bf5c85_890eeffc33c04b09a8f1c950d040ea55.pdf,

https://www.planuniversity.org/_files/ugd/bf5c85_890eeffc33c04b09a8f1c950d040ea55.pdf

19:23:31 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

Nancy, we are not developers wanting to know how to create the maximum

amount of density possible and what incentives would be necessary to include. We are concerned residents who are still waiting for answers to the many questions we've asked, and reaction to the comments we've made. You're not hearing us!

19:23:31 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

I have not seen metrics beyond the San Diego Housing Plan and SANDAG RHNA numbers; those do not support the 61K to 81K numbers. Still have no idea where those numbers came from and how they were generated and how this is equitable.

19:23:32 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

William B: good question! I haven't heard a response to the point that the entire plan is based on faulty figures.

19:24:09 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

Katie Rodolico is spot on.

19:24:18 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

Third option is no increase in density.

19:24:18 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

A "rolled back" plan is where we should start.

19:24:25 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

3rd option is to leave us alone

19:24:28 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Why and what is the rationale for any density when North UC has provided thousands of units since 1987?

19:24:39 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

She is saying the two plans are it. That's it. This is the only chance to eliminate it?

19:24:55 From Carole Pietras to Everyone:

Agree with Katie R.

19:24:56 From Tom Mullaney to Everyone:

Linda Bernstein suggested starting from the beginning. One way would be for the committee to take control of the agenda, hire your own planner, and start with the current community, what's on the ground now. Then propose a moderate amount of added density in limited areas, with adequate parks.

19:25:06 From David Broide to Everyone:

Its deceptive to roll back and then add back bonus to come back to the same increased density

19:25:34 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

College area came up with their alternate plan this month, ignoring the City's two major density scenarios.

19:25:53 From Eric Cohen to Everyone:

She said she has to provide a plan for increased density. Whether we want it or not.

19:26:22 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Developers ALWAYS get to build BEFORE they deliver on the mitigation; the same will happen with the incentives. Maybe the city should change how it does business???

19:26:29 From William Batista to Everyone:

Roll back the densities that have not been justified by data in the first place?

19:26:34 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Some community plan updates have rolled back density. It is not unheard of. Read them.

19:27:09 From Angie Jones to Everyone:

We need to do what the College area did (College area came up with their alternate plan this month, ignoring the City's two major density scenarios).

19:27:42 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

Don't need a breakout session!

19:27:46 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

How can a city that is this wealthy have such poor infrastructure, so few parks, so few public benefits, so many homeless, so much PUBLIC land that is poorly managed (think the DeAnza point abandoned trailer park)???

19:27:52 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

It is a positive if we can start with current AS BUILT. Not a positive if it starts with these two plans. Which is what is so unclear.

19:27:57 From Rebecca Robinson Wood to Everyone:

1958 Community Plan included 3,855 acres of residential land. the Existing Conditions report shows 1,820 acres of residential land, 47% of that proposed the first Community Plan.

19:28:08 From William Batista to Everyone:

A lot of the "public comments" have been questions that have not been addressed.

19:28:22 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

College area residents had a meeting on 6 June: Premise of the meeting: You are invited to join other College Area residents in working together to create a community plan that is truly community-driven. After a brief review of the goals and context for the College Area Community Plan update, we will break into groups to develop proposals for where to locate additional housing, parks, businesses, and other social and commercial activity that will benefit all College Area residents. Unlike other public meetings where the Planning Department tells you what they want for the College Area, this is your chance to wear the community planner hat. If you are not satisfied with the "Grand Boulevards" and "15-Minute Neighborhoods" plans proposed by Mayor Gloria's Planning Department, please help us build a plan that better aligns with the College Area community.

19:28:23 From Deborah Knight to Everyone:

A bonus exchange could be a good approach, however we don't know what the baseline is that we are exchanging against.

19:28:29 From paul goldstein to Everyone:

We would be happy to discuss incentives and bonuses. AFTER the need for a density increase has been justified.

19:28:37 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Thanks Angie Jones for that information! How did they manage that?

19:29:35 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Thanks Jennifer!

19:30:04 From Thomas Hekman to Everyone:

Gee, thanks for assuming the rest of us don't have a question.

19:30:10 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

I feel like we're being threatened to agree to her "carrot" incentive plan or she's going to go back to the "stick" previous oversized growth plan and she'll just push it through. is there any way we can stop the crazy growth? oh Angie Jones that is hopeful about the college area

19:30:53 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

Great comment and sum up Linda

19:31:47 From Karen Arden to Everyone:

Thank you Linda - your comment is absolutely where I am.

19:32:25 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

No carrots dangled to keep our essential services. Sprouts and Vons are non negotiable

19:33:01 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

I agree with Linda!

19:56:19 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

Room 8 had no sub-committee leader

19:57:23 From Suzy Shamsky to Everyone:

I am not able to intelligently comment about any of the "benefits" with so little information and time.

19:57:32 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Suggest City solicit agenda items for the next meeting from the community.

19:59:15 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

This was very challenging. It seems like we were being asked to redo the work of the subcommittee of the past three years in 20 minutes without the benefits of maps or existing uses.

19:59:19 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Can the previous chat content be shared with we participants? It has now been re-set.

20:00:55 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

Linda B sounds about right...

20:01:31 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Mixed use very worrying. Developers will want what is good for them and not the community. Losing our rental should be non negotiable and Mixed use might not be viable

20:07:47 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

Was it Alexandria who took over Costa Verde shopping center?

20:07:59 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Jason: We also talked about the premise of UC providing thousands of units to date to the City of San Diego in North UC, and continue to provide thousands of units that are not affordable for students. We also talked about the trolley being built AFTER all of the housing units have been added, not before and that one of the premises of the trolley was to provide mobility for students to live outside of UC.

20:09:02 From Jason Moorhead to Everyone:

Thanks for the reminder to Room 4 comments, Jennifer.

20:10:08 From Jason Moorhead to Everyone:

Yes, Elizabeth - Alexandria owns Costa Verde

20:10:34 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

I agree with the sentiment there shouldn't be "incentives" to builders in exchange for the listed community benefits. Parks, open spaces, sustainable building, etc. should be part of any responsible development -- period. I personally am not willing to accept more traffic congestion that would go along with higher density no matter what "incentive" is being offered and that probably wouldn't materialize anyway if builders are allowed to proceed without providing infrastructure first.

20:11:52 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Bonnie has a point ... any increase in density is going to impact our lives ...

traffic is already a huge issue.

20:14:00 From Elizabeth Manion to Everyone:

list of retail

20:15:09 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

For Debbie Knight's room, we also discussed that density should be tied to requiring parking spaces and commercial needs such as grocery stores. This should not be an incentive, it should be part of the zoning requirements. Remember that South UC is not a transit priority area.

20:18:46 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

That affordable housing policy should be City wide, not just UC. This should be City policy on developments. Look at the lack of success in downtown developments.

20:22:45 From Neil Hyytinen to Everyone:

Respectfully, I think the Room 8 discussion was a bit broader than what Elizabeth represented. I personally believe that the incentives discussion deserves more analysis and discussion. Give staff an opportunity to respond. Thanks!

20:23:03 From ANita Wilson to Everyone:

Also keep our post office by Sprouts

20:23:11 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

Many of us living in south UC, including me, purchased a home here because it is such a walkable community with Sprouts and other vital shops and services within walking distance. We don't want that to change.

20:25:05 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

I am curious what other shopping centers in the City of San Diego that are not in a TPA, that have one bus route, that have all of this housing proposed by the City Planning Department.

20:29:02 From Suzy Shamsky to Everyone:

The proposal should be an iterative process; the City proposes a scenario, the Community provides specific comments, the City revises the proposal based on those comments, the Community again provides specific comments, etc.

20:30:32 From Joann Selleck to Planning Department City of San Diego(Direct Message):

Nancy, group 10 also wants to spend the next 3 or 4 meetings discussing the metrics supporting the need for increased density planned and discussing each of the areas of planned increased density....and determining if an alternative plan is needed (and what it should be).

20:32:40 From Rebecca Robinson Wood to Everyone:

I forgot to mention concern for possible high rise buildings in south UC. Also, solar roofs, and eco walls were promoted.

20:33:23 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

Before the City forges ahead and discusses "incentives," we would like officials to address its flawed planning process and errors made in its metrics, as was so eloquently pointed out by Linda Beresford at the last Planning Update meeting.

20:34:53 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Agreed. The May 2022 meeting comments from the public still need to be addressed by the City.

20:35:04 From Nancy Groves to Everyone:

How can we get a copy of the CHAT?

20:35:23 From LISA BREZINA to Everyone:

The incentive is MONEY!!!! And why look at UC because this plan will be picked up by the developers compared to all the others that Nancy Graham referred to in the last in person meeting.

20:35:39 From William Batista to Everyone:

Can addressing Linda Beresford's questions from May be an agenda item for the next meeting? I think most of the community would find that time well spent.

20:35:43 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Thanks Nancy for listening to us. That gives us some hope

20:36:03 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Address the comments from May 2022. Should have done today, but City can do next time.

20:36:18 From David Rideout to Everyone:

The three dots on the right lead to a "save chat" option for me. Seems to include everything back to the beginning of the meeting.

20:36:25 From Ginger Livingston to Everyone:

yes we all want answers to Linda Beresford's questions.

20:36:30 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

Thanks to Nancy and Suchi and all the volunteers with UCPG and CPUS.

20:36:43 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Grow in the other areas; again how many housing units have been added in UC since 1987 compared to other areas? You need to address this City of San Diego.

20:37:01 From Jennifer Martin-Roff to Everyone:

Breakout rooms was a good idea. Thank you.

20:37:06 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

Please plan next meeting agenda to answer the previously asked questions

20:37:11 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

But the population data says that UC is not going to grow as much as you suggest. This is especially true if UCSD is building more housing for its students.

20:37:25 From Ellie Yakatan to Everyone:

I'm wondering what percentage of the current plan is undeveloped-how many new development units does the current plan allow for?

20:37:27 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Agenda items need to be solicited by the community.

20:37:35 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Please save chat

20:38:22 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

UC needs to be treated equitably in terms of housing as compared to other communities for the last 20 years.

20:38:31 From Bonnie Kutch to Everyone:

Yes, please save the Chat and inform us on how we can access it after this meeting.

20:38:41 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Thank you Nancy! What were the processes used in Barrio Logan and College communities that allowed them to come up with more community-focused processes and plans?

20:38:49 From Diane Ahern to Everyone:

I agree that questions posed should be answered.

20:39:09 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

College area residents took matters into their own hands from my

understanding.

20:39:20 From Isabelle Kay to Everyone:

Usually I CAN save chat, but not this time on this machine☺

20:39:27 From Katerina Semendeferi to Everyone:

Thank you, Nancy, for working with us and planning to revisit the plans!

20:39:31 From Mack Langston to Everyone:

Thanks Andy

20:39:38 From Suzy Shamsky to Everyone:

Nancy,

20:39:52 From Chris Zibert to Everyone:

Thank you all for conciliatory tone

20:40:12 From Linda Beresford to Everyone:

Will the chat be saved as part of the public record?

20:40:15 From Linda Bernstein to Everyone:

Please confirm that chat is being saved

20:40:58 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Suggest agenda to discuss the multiple questions that have been posed by the community. May 2022 and today.

20:40:59 From Kelsey Feinstein to Everyone:

I copied and pasted the chat from 6:40pm and on when I joined Zoom. Email me at Kelsey@san.rr.com and I'll send it to you

20:41:29 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

Why should UC be worried about the City's grants?

20:41:39 From William Batista to Everyone:

Validating underlying growth assumptions should be in one of those boxes.

20:43:27 From Jennifer Dunaway to Everyone:

The schedule shown is too ambitious based on the input from April to today.