

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
March 11, 2025
6:00 PM

Meeting held at the Terranova Conference Room, third floor of Alexandria's GradLabs building.

Directors present, directors absent

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Daren Esposito (DE), Jon Arenz (JA), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Carol Uribe (CU), Georgia Kayser (GK), Karen Martien (KMar), Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA), Anna Bryan (AB), Emma Chavez (EC), Mike Borisov (MB), Henry Taylor-Goalby (HTG), Coby Tomlins (CT-City of SD Planning).

1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair. Chair CN at 6:00 pm.

2. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.

CN: Any additions or corrections to the agenda? Motion to approve NdR, seconded by CN.
Passed without objection,

3. Approval of Minutes: January 14, 2025.

CN: Are there any changes for the January 14, 2025, minutes?

CN: Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Moved by JA, seconded by DE.
Approved unanimously, 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain.

4. Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report

CN: We have a full agenda tonight, so we'll just move on to Pure Water followed by public comment.

My thanks to Kerry Santoro in the back of the room at the election table, She has been here since 5PM when in person voting started and will be here until 8PM.

5. Information Item: Pure Water Project. The pure water construction team will present an update on the project. Mike Parks, Yvette Gonzalez-Mendez, Carlos Molina.

Carlos provided an update on the Pure Water project, focusing on the northern pipeline and tunnels project. He reported that the tunnels at Sr. 52 and Rose Canyon are

complete, with 1,661 linear feet installed. The pipeline installation at Sr. 52 and the Rose Canyon tunnels is ongoing, with 34,000 linear feet installed in total. The work has been delayed due to inclement weather. The project involves installing two pipelines, a 30-inch and a 48-inch pipeline, with the 30-inch pipeline already installed and paved over. The work will occur during daytime hours, with occasional night work and Saturday work. The project will impact traffic, with single lane traffic in both directions along Genesee and flaggers assisting pedestrians and bicyclists. The anticipated date for the work at the intersection of Genesee and Decoro is late April 2025. There is a 72-hour road closure of the northbound lane with a 12-hour closure of the southbound lane at SR 52 scheduled for late April from Friday to Monday.

Q: ST: I know you said that you had flaggers at Decoro during operation hours, but it seems like one big congestion point is the absence of flaggers during peak traffic hours. Can you talk to that?

Carlos M: We have received many community complaints about this and are talking to city officials. It's been made more difficult by the rain. We should have a solution by tomorrow.

Q: KM: What is the timeline for opening both lanes south of Governor to the 52?

Carlos M: The contractor is working on making the connection across Genesee avenue directly under SR 52. This is an open cut that had to be redone to replace a segment that was not compliant. When that work is done, the lanes will reopen.

KM: It seems the schedule has slipped significantly since last October. Can you explain the delay?

Carlos: It's a scheduling conflict with the contractor. There were delays with the tunneling that pushes the rest of the schedule out. Now that we have completed the tunneling, we can more accurately predict the rest of the schedule. My estimate for completion is 8 to 12 weeks after the late April SR 52 closure.

6. Public Comment: Comments on items not on the agenda but within the scope of the UCPG. Two-minute limit.

Emma Johnson: Hello! I'm an alumnus of UC San Diego. I wanted to bring up an issue regarding student vehicular homelessness at UCSD and introduce an initiative for the creation of a safe parking pilot program. So, at UCSD housing, insecurity is a growing issue. Data from a UC San Diego undergraduate experience survey shows that the

percentage of students who faced housing insecurity has increased from 7 to 8% from 2020 to 2022,

While UC San Diego is planning a 6,000-bed housing village, it's not going to be ready until 2026, which leaves con students with an immediate housing insecurity need without solutions.

UC San Diego does offer services for these students, although there is a need for additional resources such as a safe parking program. I'm sure you all are aware that there are existing safe parking programs in San Diego, such as with the Jewish family services. However, what we found is that most of these safe parking programs are at capacity and are about 15 to 20 min away from campus, which can create a significant barrier for students who are facing housing insecurit

My hope with this public comment is just to raise awareness about this issue, and hope that with the insight from this committee that myself, as well as various student advocates, can get the backing to push for the creation of a safe parking pilot program at UCSD, to give students access to secure overnight parking with access to essential amenities, such as restrooms, showers, and wi-fi to support them in their academics while they go through housing insecurity, I hope to delve further into this topic at a subsequent meeting if it's of interest to the committee. Additionally, I would welcome any conversations about this issue if anybody wanted to reach out to me personally.

7. Presentations.

- Zach Burton, CM Lee.

I'll highlight the "no cost" Dumpster Day, partnering with Mira Mesa High School. They are participating in the Aspen Challenge for environmental causes so it will be a win-win. Big, bulk items are welcome. The next item I wanted to mention was a budget crash course Webinar with the Independent Budget Analyst. It's going to be March 20th and it's a remote virtual meeting. Better understand the budgeting process. It's going to be a challenging budget cycle. So, the more people can understand about that, we feel that'll be useful. And then, as a follow up to that, our office is going to be hosting a town hall that'll likely be in person. Once the mayor releases the preliminary budget and we'll be accepting community feedback on that. So this will be a good 10. The crash course to get your foundation, and you'll be better prepared for our town hall and as soon as the mayor releases that preliminary budget, we'll have an update on dates on that.

- Andy Wiese for Kristin Camper: There was a low flight over south UC today About 4 o'clock it was very loud and very different from normal, so somebody I don't know if they were lost, but it just felt a little a little weird, and all of that rain to have a screaming jet not too far over the top of our houses.

KC: I will check on this.

- Georgia Kayser (CIP Chair). I'm working on fixing the CIP survey ranking tool so we can use it to both record our CIP choices and rank them. When finished, we'll provide a link to it.

CN: We were able to put the UC community library project onto the CIP list for the Mayor's office and our CMs offices. It would be nice to be able to rank this list and rank other things easily. All the board members have a current list of our CIP projects.

8. **Action Item: PRJ-1114437, Alexandria 10210 Campus Point Project. The Alexandria Campus Point Project proposes: (i) a new subdivision map covering the entire campus to subdivide 11 existing lots into 15 lots, consistent with the Campus Point Master Plan, (ii) a Site Development Permit (SDP) to allow a residential density of 60 DUs/acre within the MCAS Miramar Transition Zone (TZ) consistent with City requirements and the recently approved University CPU, and (iii) a deviation to allow building heights up to 180 feet, where 120 feet is allowed under the EMX zone.**

The project is a Process 5 approval because the proposed subdivision map includes vacations and additional grant of right-of-way to extend the current terminus of Campus Point Drive to the north. The applicant is also requesting new access between Campus Point Court and Genesee (right-in, right-out) on the proposed subdivision map which is consistent with the University CPU. The entitlements are limited to the mapping actions and SDP to increase allowable future residential development within the TZ (up to approximately 2,200 DUs) and no actual development is proposed by or covered by the pending entitlements. Neil Hyytinen, Hecht Solberg LLP, Carson Edgington, Rick Engineering, and Chris Clement, ARE, presenting.

Neil Hyytinen (NH): Chris [Clement] and I met with Chris and Andy. And you guys put together a list of questions which we responded to. I think that's been distributed to the group. And we're not going to get into the minutia on all that stuff. We thought we'd focus on the key items. But you know if you have any questions during the presentation, we'd be happy to respond.

Neil deRamos: I must recuse from this discussion and vote.

Anna Bryan: I must recuse from this discussion and vote.

Chris Clement (CC): We were here last month as an action item, and we turned that into an information item. We are back this month as an action item. We received several comments back. Neil and I met with Andy and Chris and talked through those. I think you have received our responses at this point. We appreciate the feedback, commentary, and the partnership.

We wanted to define what we're here to talk about today: the Site Development Permit (SDP) that we are processing through the city now, and we're here to request your support. There are really three main components to the SDP, the first of which is a mapping action. So it's the subdivision of our existing 11 lots that are there at Campus Point today into 15 new lots that align with our Master plan or the conceptual master plan that we are advancing today. Also, as a component of that plan, we will add a new egress from the campus to Genesee at the west end of the Scripps properties which we recently acquired between Scripps and Qualcomm and is being pursued with the city. We request a deviation to 180' from 120' in building height. We are requesting as part of the SDP to authorize up to 60 Dwelling Units (DU) / acre in the Transition Zone allowed under the Land Development Code.

The Master Plan calls for controlling each parcel under a separate LLC. It also calls for an easement vacation in the current cul-de-sac between the Leidos building and the Lilly building. We will grant additional easements to push that cul-de-sac further north to be on the north side of the Lilly building and better align the two existing roads that are there today. We'll be implementing the community plan and providing additional ingress/egress from Campus Point to Genesee for emergency vehicles and daily commuters.

The next topic is our height deviation that we're proposing. We're proposing a total of 180 feet, and I'll tell you how we arrived at that number. To be honest with you, it's not a super scientific number. It's just a number that we thought was fair and reasonable in what we could potentially foresee being a potential future requirement. There's a couple of reasons why we were proposing this, so this allows us to have a tighter footprint, more permeable area, less impervious area, less building sprawl. If we are held to 120 to get the same amount of built area would obviously require a larger footprint. The 180 allows us to get a little bit more density, a lot better site planning a lot better green space and more open space. So that's one rationale. The next is our overhead, clear space around our buildings, where we build lab office buildings that are research and development buildings. They're a little bit different than what you might think of when you think of an apartment building that's maybe 10- or 12-foot floor to floor. Our buildings started a base of like 15 foot floor to floor.

We're seeing that increase quite a bit up to maybe 17-to-20-foot floor to floor, depending on where you are in the building. The rationale for that is that we have such heavy mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, such robust buildings to support the lab functions that are in the building and the R&D there that we need that additional overhead space to get the systems in and still retain nice, open ceilings. When you walk our labs, even the GradLabs building here, you'll note that we have ceilings are never lower than 10 feet. We're able to achieve that with such robust buildings, with the higher floor to floor,

We're really seeing an increase now in structural rigidity. The rationale is that robotics and automated systems require a much higher level of sensitivity. You must have a very low MIPS (micro inches per second) so the floor plates. don't deviate like they would, and say, a typical office building when you walk across the floor. We have deeper structure in order to create higher structural rigidity and lower MIPS. That's deeper steel and deeper concrete with more rebar in it. We also have rooftop units on the tops of almost all our buildings. This building is a good example. If you drive by it on a nice day when you can see this, when you can see the roof, you'll see that we have exhaust fans that poke out above our roof screen by probably about 4 to 5 feet. We have a very robust system on the tops of all our roofs. and we have to account for that. We want to make sure that those are architecturally pleasing. Therefore, we put a roof screen on all our buildings, and we typically will have the exhaust fans poke up above those so we can make sure that we don't have any air entrainment into the air handler units.

So those are kind of the main reasons why we talked with Chris and Andy and Andy thought it'd be helpful for us to kind of walk through some of our rationale for needing a higher overall building height potentially. We don't have any plans today to build anything that's 180-foot tall, but we just thought it'd be helpful to explain our rationale for that for that request. We're on the 3rd floor of this building tonight, and this building is 13-foot floor to floor. It's a cast in place concrete building, so it's slightly lower floor to floor than a steel building. We don't have the steel beams below our decks. We just have a cast in place concrete deck.

And finally, we were asked to speak to the amount of campus acreage in the project. We broke that out. We've got about 63 acres that are in the APZ-2 zone and 33 2/3 acres in the transition zone plus a little bit more that's outside of the transition zone just at the north end of GradLabs. That totals 100 acres.

All of that's going to be implemented at the Ministerial level, which is really what's contemplated in the CPU so we don't really have at this point a lot of design related detail in terms of where the residential could potentially go. Alexandria likes Lots 15 and 16 for residential, maybe one more lot. We don't know at this point, and whether

2,200 units of residential will ever be developed. That's really an open question. But since we had to go through the SDP process, we wanted to base the unit count on the total acreage within the transition zone. There really needs to be a mixed-use component with residential close to these employment center, so that's a rationale. Note the Transition Zone is not in the Federal planning documents, but a city concept added in the last revision of its plan.

CN: We'll entertain questions and comments.

KM: I would encourage you to reduce the jargon and simplify the presentations. You said lots 15 and 16 were the most desirable, but you're not proposing to take the entire 2,200 dwelling units in those two units? Would the height limit variance apply to just residential, or everything?

Chris Clement: We are not proposing to put the full amount of residential allowed onto residential on lots 15 and 16. We want to memorialize the 2,200-unit total to show how much residential could be available. If we were to build to 180' it would be for R&D laboratory buildings. For residential, we would be thinking of a design consisting of 5 stories of residential units over three stories of parking.

Jon Arenz: I might need to recuse if Coffman Engineering is helping on any projects at Campus Point.

Chris Clement: No, Coffman Engineering is not working on any new developments for Campus Point.

Debby Knight: Two things, bird strikes and the nine stories of a 180' building, and how bright these buildings are. I can see Illumina from my house and sometimes it's lit all night. The interface between the MHPA and the buildings are a major concern.

Chris Clement: At this point we are just subdividing and not thinking about glass or building design, but when we get to the point of a specific building design for a tenant, we will be, as this is a valid concern. The building will have to comply with the MHPA adjacency guidelines, and there are some conservation easements as well. To the extent that Alexandria has control over access, we will restrict it into the MHPA.

Andy Wiese: Thank you for responding to the questions we had from last time. I'm still concerned about the issue of safety in the Transition Zone. I agree that it makes a great deal of sense to have mixed use development where there are a lot of jobs, but there is also the issue of 5,000 to 7,000 overflights by military jets. We know the APZ-2 is where the majority of the 5-7,000 jets go. There is a not-small number of flights that cross over into the TZ. The Airport Authority restricted housing in the TZ, presumably due to safety. If you are asking us to share responsibility for deciding to

go forward with a project that might put 600 or 2,200 units of housing in the TZ, we need to understand why you think it's safe to build housing in an area where a short time ago the city did not believe it was safe.

Neil Hyytinen: I would characterize it differently, Andy. It's not the city that was thinking it was not safe to put housing in the TZ, but the Airport Authority, sitting as the Airport Land Use Commission and it was based on a recommendation of their consultant to expand the area beyond what is covered in the ALUCP. I think both the city and a lot of the stakeholders pushed back on that. But that's what the airport authority went with. When the city proposed this code change to allow up to 60 DUs per acre that had to go to the airport authority for a determination, and they ultimately ended up supporting that code change. The transition zone is still in the ALUCP. There's no question about that. And I would argue that the Site Development permit requirement is somewhat archaic, particularly when you look at the Mira Mesa plan update and the University plan update. There are huge swaths within the transition zone that would be appropriate to have mixed use with the residential component. Now, there are some requirements, and I think we touched upon them. There's a clustering requirement and there's a requirement to maximize open area. The future residential is going to have to comply with that criterion and the maximum density of 60 DUs per acre in aggregate based on the transition. I was involved with the planning effort on the ALUCP updates, and nobody but the consultant liked that recommendation at the time. This is going back to 2006 or 2007. It's overreaching, that's my opinion, but I would offer downtown SD or Coronado Naval Air Station, Coronado. They've got tons of flights going over residential areas, bankers, hill point. Loma. You want to be mindful of safety considerations and do good planning. But we still need housing, particularly in this context, mixed use with the residential component. There are already many overflights of both commercial and residential areas in San Diego, so I don't think we're breaking new ground.

Andy Wiese: The shuttle with 10-year monitoring. Would that need to be a condition to ensure it goes forward?

Neil: It's already a condition of our existing Neighborhood Development Permit and will be continuing since it's such a good idea. It's included in our leases, and the tenants expect it. We plan to run it in perpetuity.

AW: Thank you for the proposed cut-throughs from Campus Point to Genesee. Would you say a little more about what you've done so far, especially about how it might impact Genesee?

Chris Clement: Our engineers are working on evaluating the safety and appropriateness of the right-in, right-out design and how it might help the traffic

backup between Campus Point to I-5. I think our traffic consultants are going to have to prove to City Transportation that the plan is safe and effective. It should help the smart signal program that's running on Genesee. We are waiting for UC San Diego to implement their smart signal project prior to doing ours. We expect the end of the year. It's a condition of our entitlements.

AW: There is a question of the noise impact of aircraft on potential housing. Your commercial buildings are certainly sound proofed sufficiently so the indoors are comfortable. For residential, you generally have noise attenuation to 45 CNEL.

Chris Clement: I believe there is now an industry standard that attenuates noise below 40 CNEL.

AW: Would you commit to doing the latest and greatest dual-pane window design? When we talk to a potential residential partner, that's what our intent will be.

Mike Borisov: Do you know what kind of windows UCSD used when developing their high-rise buildings?

Chris Clement: No, unfortunately not.

MB: I live on the 15th floor of the Pepper Canyon, and the noise never goes over 50 dB. I'll be pressed to hear anything at 40. I believe this is very quiet and not that big of a deal. I think it's a bigger deal if you can't find housing or a job.

Chris Clement: Thank you for the feedback. We can discuss with UC San Diego planning. We can get the specs to make sure we meet or exceed them. Andy, to your point, none of us are acoustic engineers. I don't think today we could tell you that we would be willing to agree to a specific number, but you could put it into your recommendation.

AW: I don't have specific issues with height, particularly given the comparison you showed before with other buildings. But I do think the heights of buildings directly facing onto Roselle Canyon, Lots 2, 7, 8, 17, and 18 matter. GradLabs is about 100' and is visible from the canyon. This is just over half the height of what might be proposed at 180'. You might never build that but then again, a bigger fish in the sea might end of owning this property and they might have different ideas. I'm not apposed to the board approving in increase in the height, but I would be concerned about increasing the height along the edge that faces Roselle canyon along Campus Point Drive. Debbie Knight has spoken to the issue of the migratory birds that the night lighting of bird strikes as one, but also as a human experience in that canyon, and probably also an animal experience. The size of those buildings. I think right there, facing over that steep canyon, would be an impact, an environmental impact to the

canyon that would be unwarranted. The city just approved a height limit of 120' for EMX-1 zones so you are asking for a change in a plan we spent five years making. I appreciate the arguments you have made, but I would not approve increasing the height limit to 180' for buildings 1,2,7,8,17, and 18.

Chris Clement: We'd basically be saying that 3 of the 4 potential new lab buildings would be capped at 120; in your scenario.

AW: I'm just saying not to 180'. You showed us a design that had buildings at 127', and I can imagine 130' or 140' on those sites to give space for buildings you have already envisioned, but not to go to 180'. The remaining buildings on the site would be facing Scripps and be unnoticeable. I'm going to include that in a motion. Let me ask Karen Martien and Debby Knight.

KM: I'm generally in agreement with Andy's concern about height but would add lots 1 and 9, which he did not mention. In general, I'm not comfortable raising the limit past 120' for anything on the site. You are not coming to us with specific proposals. I'm not comfortable giving you a blank check. You could come back in the future if you had specific proposals. We also must worry about the argument some other developer makes that "you did it for Alexandria" without a plan in place. I'm supportive of the mapping and increased density for the TZ. We need to take accident risk into account, but we also need housing.

KC (Kristin Camper, MCAS Miramar rep.): I believe some areas like Little Italy use triple-paned windows. Have you discussed this?

Chris Clement: No, we have not really discussed this. We know that double-paned windows get us well within the code requirements, I believe well below 40 CNEL.

KC: I would recommend that noise and overflight disclosure be given to all owners and tenants on the site.

GK: I agree with Karen, and the issue of subsequent requests for lifting the height limit.

CU: I agree with Andy on the buildings, with taller buildings away from the canyon and the canyon-facing buildings smaller.

Q: What kind of costs are associated with making a multiple set of plans, one for 180' height limit and one for a lower height?

Neil Hyytinen: I'm glad you brought that up. The cost difference is significant, more in opportunity cost than additional design cost. If we get a biotech that wants a 180' building and our limit is 120', then we must build a building using 150% of the

footprint for the same amount of lab space, reducing surrounding open space. The biotech might also just go somewhere else. This increases complexity for us, and we'd lose potential customers. Coming back for each building would require a PDP (Planned Development Permit) process and add 10 to 12 months to the timeline.

CN: I think Karen and Georgia are correct that if we make this approval this would be the last time that we see you.

Neil: Yes, unless you wanted to make a change or if you don't make the approval, I'm not sure we'll be back in any case; it's very tough to come back for each project. It would mean a change in the master plan and less green space.

Chris Clement: We don't like the idea of staggered floors for lab buildings. A rectangle is the best design as it's so efficient. So step backs as you go higher doesn't solve the problem.

KM: My objection to raising the height limit is not changed after this discussion.

JS: I think we need to separate the motion into two sets of buildings, the Roselle Canyon facing buildings, and the rest of the site. I don't think these can be combined.

MB: I come from Los Angeles, and I think San Diego is a lot of the same issues as Los Angeles when it comes to not building enough housing or building enough spaces for jobs. And we're losing a lot of people to places like Texas, Austin, Dallas, because they just simply build more. And I think there's a certain amount of entitlement, and privilege when it comes to living in wealthy in San Diego. Do you think that your views are more important than people's livelihoods. When it comes to living on the streets or living in a house having employment and not having employment. Here we have a developer who's literally potentially in the building. Mixed use development right next to transit for the next decade, and we're denying them flexibility because of birds, I mean, how many birds are killed with urban sprawl, expansion, single family homes getting extended from wildfires, expansion. This is like a very upsetting conversation in here because I may not even see this project going to fruition. I might graduate by this time I leave, but other people will benefit. Younger people will benefit. Businesses will benefit people, The fact that people are having conversations about height reserves this, and that while those are important to mention like, let's say, friendly glass. The conversation about height and larger, largely around development of the whole of University City, which is quite embarrassing, honestly concerning the fact that I have a university here. Top 3 in the nation, 115,000, 130,000 applicants per year. People want to come here. This is really a hub. And we're demanding development. So those are my comments, and I'll be booking them on a motion.

AW: I'll speak to your concerns, Mike. These meetings can be long and tedious, but they're also detail oriented because the details matter. I think you'll find that this group is not anti-development in any way. I've been a member of this board for 12 years, and in that time, without question, I put my thumb in the air for more commercial real estate than any community planner in the city. We have seen this prior to the plan update. We saw more than 20 different amendments to the community plan, all of them to increase density, most of them to increase political density, and we favored all of them, every single one. We also had questions, concerns, and I think we can look around the community, and we can see all kinds of improvements that have come along with those concerns. Starting way back in 2012 open space protected here increased height development over there. The buildings where Apple is today on Town Center Drive are there because of changes that we made recommendations for that we made to shift development from land that shouldn't be developed to land that ought to be. This is a board that really believes that development of this biotech hub is critical and important to the city of San Diego. The new housing is important and critical to the people of San Diego. But we also recognize that there are other things that have to be balanced with that, including the open space, including those birds, one billion of whom are killed every year by strikes into glass, and which we can attenuate by better design. Alexandria has been a model developer in the community, in terms of leading in sustainability in a range of different ways. Simply, let's get the details right, because we won't see, we won't see them again. This will be the one approval for everything that happens up there going forward in the future. That's right. Given that, I think it's important that we're careful. Now, the one moment that we must provide that input and hopefully make that make that work. So that would be my argument. Why, make those changes? I think that 130 feet is a more appropriate level on those canyon facing parcels. But one eye to the rest. Happy to hear other discussion.

Neil Hyttinen: Could I chime in just real quickly provide a little bit of context? With the plan update and the rezone to EMX-1, there wasn't a determination that this area that's rezoned should be subject to 120-foot height limit that was already in the EMX-1 zone. Previously all of this was IP-1-1 and still is. But the area that was rezoned to EMX was IP-1-1 which has no height limit. In 2017 the SDP was approved for what was called CP-3 at the time. It's now where BMS's building is being developed. That was approved at 10 and a half stories, which is about 160 feet, and that's not including screening and stuff on top of the building. Andy, you mentioned 130 to 140. Chris Clement and I aren't able to say we are agreeable, but 140' sounds much better than 130' for these lots we're talking about. This could be more flexible for us.

KM: I'm not happy with the creep upwards in height. I thought we were talking about 120. I'm not comfortable about arbitrarily increasing the height limit.

AW: I'll restate the motion.

KM: Could (Chris Clement, Neil Hyytinen) explain again why you prefer 140?

Our buildings have a 10-foot ceiling in them, and between the ceiling and the structure there is a bunch of systems that are required. If you have a 14-foot deck to deck building, the concrete in one level and you measure up to the concrete in the next level. If that's 14 feet, and then you have 3 feet of structure. That means the bottom of your structure is at 11 feet. So if you have a 10 foot tall ceiling and an 11 foot bottom of structure, by the time you add lights to there you can't add duct, or plumbing or conduits, and so 17 feet allows us to place large ducts that have air and significant plumbing and lab gas services in that interstitial space between the ceiling and the structure above.

KM: Right, but 16 feet isn't enough.

Chris Clement; Right, exactly.

KM: So, your minimum ceiling height, your minimum floor to floor is 17 feet. That's your requirement.

Chris Clement: That is our standard.

CN: I need to call the question. I'll call the roll. The vote will be in two parts. The first part is the motion on the floor without the height limit provision, the second part will be just the height limit provision.

Motion: The UCPG recommends the project as presented, including the mapping actions subdividing the existing 11 parcels into 15 parcels, the new egresses to and from Genesee, the increase in density to 60 DU/acre in the airport Transition Zone, various easements, and vacations.

The UCPG further recommends as a condition of approval that Alexandria:

- **Exceed the city standard for noise attenuation in its residential construction, seeking the maximum possible in noise attenuation at the time of development.**
- **Provide notification to all potential owners and lessors of the properties (residential and commercial) of overflight noise from MCAS Miramar. This recommendation was urged by our MCAS Miramar representative.**
- **Design buildings with state-of-the-art bird safe design, and with attention to nighttime lighting's effect on the adjacent open space slopes and MHPA.**

- **Construct a fence on the northwest corner of the site (Lot 1) to prevent entry from the property onto the adjacent MHPA.**

Moved by AW, Second by MB

Approved unanimously, 9 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain, with 2 Recusals (AB, NdR), members work or partner with ARE. Chair not voting.

Motion to approve the height limit change for canyon-facing lots at 140', with the remainder of the lots at 180'.

Moved by AW, Second by CU

Motion failed. 4 Yes (DE, CU, AW, FA), 5 No (JA, GK, KM, EC, MB), 0 Abstain, and 2 Recusals (AB, NdR), members work or partner with ARE. Chair not voting.

Neil Hyytinen: I would like to make a suggestion. I think everyone is on the same page with the first items, A, B, C. If we could get an affirmative vote on those items, then whatever we end up doing with the height limit can be in a separate motion.

AW: Before we go to another motion, I'd like to speak to the reasons why I think this is a good idea. I'm not concerned about some of the things I've heard. For Karen and Georgia, I hear your concerns about wildlife and the idea of a precedent. I don't feel that we're setting a precedent. I think we saw a detailed set of potential plans for the site that is almost half-built and that allows us to see very clearly what the style and design of the site is going forward. I think it does make sense to be flexible, and I don't feel comfortable with the 180' along the edge of the canyon as the building is very high, almost twice the size of the GradLabs building. I think it's important to have spaces set aside for concentration, for people to enjoy the experience outdoors, so I think it's a pretty good compromise to limit the height of the canyon edge buildings.

MB: I am someone who has lived in an apartment and who now lives in a high rise. I don't really agree with that opinion, the arguments being made about me overlooking a certain green space or a parkway, and it's just privacy or comfortability breaking them. Maybe it is green. That's your reality. It's not mine. I'm fine with people looking over. And I think that's not realistic comment to me. I don't know how many people are looking out over their workspace or residential space into like your yard or park. I don't buy it. We live in San Diego, second biggest city in the State. We are denser than other regions in the city of San Diego. And if a developer here is requesting a variance and is going to be providing better jobs, then good, right? Every single floor you add

is better machinery, more state of the art technology, better paying jobs, right here for students, potentially, and alumni.

911

02:22:47.460 --> 02:22:59.660

Chris Nielsen: every single book, when I understand every single point you add, get it to add better machinery, a more state of the art technology. That's better paying jobs right off here for students, potentially. Or you know, alumni. I don't actually buy the privacy argument of with a potential height increase, but I appreciate the comments you made.

AW: I wasn't speaking to privacy necessarily in the way that you that you up frame it, but rather, but rather that that ability to be away from, and that's not all for humans, but for non-humans to be away from. The presence of the urban core. I think it's one of the things that makes sense about really a special place like this is that ability to have these building designs that allows us to have, you know, not just the big city and the big population and the big job center. But it could be, the most popular metropolitan area in North America, one of the most biodiverse on earth. That's America's Amazon across Campus Point.

KM: The 140' still seems arbitrary to me. I'd be happy to vote for a motion that keeps the canyon buildings at 120' and increases the other buildings on site to 180'.

Chris Clement: The building right now is 17-foot floor to floor on every floor except for the ground floor. The ground floor is 20-foot floor to floor. So that's not just the back of the envelope pulled it out of thin air number but is based on what we're doing today. We meet with potential tenants who want to either expand or locate in San Diego with significant operations and potential requirements that exist in the world. And those requirements are what we're looking to accommodate. The difference between 120 and 140 for every is for every twenty feet that we take off the building we must add 40,000 square feet at the ground level.

AW: I am going to make my motion again. We passed Resolution 1 previously. Resolution 2 deals with the height limit. We want to disapprove of setting the height limit to 180' over the entire site but approve 140' for canyon facing buildings and 180' for the rest.

[The entirety of the two resolutions is given below. Voting on Resolution #1 occurred earlier. Voting will occur on Resolution #2. *Findings* were added in the recommendation letter sent to Development Services.]

Resolution #1. The UCPG recommends approval for the following as presented:

1. Mapping actions:

- a. A new subdivision map covering the entire campus to subdivide 11 existing lots into 15 lots, consistent with the Campus Point Master Plan.**
 - b. New egresses to and from Genesee Ave.**
 - c. Partial vacation and additional grants of right-of-way.**
- 2. A Site Development Permit (SDP) to allow a residential density of 60 DU's/acre within the MCAS Miramar Transition Zone (TZ) consistent with City requirements and the recently approved University Community CPU.**

The UCPG further recommends as a condition of approval that Alexandria:

- o Exceed the city standard for noise attenuation in its residential construction, seeking the maximum possible in noise attenuation at the time of development.**
- o Provide notification to all potential owners and lessors of the properties (residential and commercial) of overflight noise from MCAS Miramar. This recommendation was urged by our MCAS Miramar representative.**
- o Design buildings with state-of-the-art bird safe design, and with attention to nighttime lighting's effect on the adjacent open space slopes and MHPA.**
- o Construct a fence on the northwest corner of the site (Lot 1) to prevent entry from the property onto the adjacent MHPA.**

Moved by AW, Second by MB

Approved unanimously, 9 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain, with 2 Recusals (AB, NdR), members work or partner with ARE. Chair not voting.

Resolution #2. The UCPG does not recommend approval for the deviation raising the height limit to 180 feet from 120 feet for the entire site, but instead:

- a. The UCPG recommends approval of a height limit of 140' for buildings facing Campus Point Drive and the north edge of the site (lot numbers 1, 9, 2, 7, 8, 17, and 18).**

- b. The UCPG recommends approval of a deviation for a new height limit of 180' for buildings on the rest of the Campus Point site.**

Moved by AW, Second by DE

Approved, 5 Yes (DE, JA, CU, AW, FA), 4 No (GK, KM, EC, MB), 0 Abstain, 2 Recusals (AB, NdR), members work or partner with ARE. Chair not voting.

Findings:

The UCPG believes that our recommended height deviation balances important goals related to the project site.

- a. A height deviation to 140' is warranted on lots 1,2,7,8,17, and 18, which adjoin or face Roselle Canyon and Sorrento Valley headlands, to achieve the building design and leasing goals of the applicant, while a 140' limit will minimize impacts to open space recreation, natural resource, the MHPA, including visual impacts to canyon users and light, noise, and physical impacts to wildlife due to night lighting and bird strikes.
 - b. The UCPG recommends that a height deviation to 180' is appropriate on the remainder of the site lots which do not face sensitive open space and natural resources to enhance flexibility of site design for the applicant, including maximizing tenant amenities and open space at ground level.
- 9. Information Item: PRJ-1086203, Public Project Sorrento Mesa Double Track Phase 2. SANDAG is proposing a project to double track a 2-mile segment of the rail corridor between Sorrento and Miramar, located in the LOSSAN Rail Corridor between the I-805 freeway overpass in Sorrento Valley south to Miramar Road. The goals of the project are 1) to realign the rail to smooth out the tight curves and lessen the derailment potential of freight trains and, 2) add a second track to add capacity for passenger trains and avoid "train meets" so opposing trains can pass one another and, 3) reduce travel times by increasing the passenger train speed from 25mph to 40mph. Realignment of the rail will involve some slope grading that impacts ten properties with City open space easements, which will require partial easement vacations. The grading will also impact the City MHPA overlay zone and an MHPA boundary line adjustment (BLA) has been prepared. The MHPA BLA is included in the project Biological Technical Report along with a Conceptual Revegetation Plan. Mike Widman, TYLin Co., Erich Lathers, BRG Inc., Tim DeWitt, SANDAG, and Amanda Gonzales, Merkel Inc., presenting.**

Due to lateness of the hour (9:15), it was agreed with the applicants that they present in April as the primary item on the agenda.

10. UCPG Election Results:

UCPG ELECTION - RESULTS

Seat	Candidate(s)	Term Expires	Votes
R1-C	Andy Wiese	2028	10
B1-B	Vacant	2027	
B1-C	Vacant	2028	
R2-C	Daren Esposito	2028	13
B2-B	Vacant	2027	
B2-C	Neil DeRamos	2028	3
R3-A	Josh Kenchel	2026	1
R3-B	Sasha Treadup	2027	3
R3-C	Jon Arenz	2028	2
B3-A	Vacant	2026	
B3-B	Vacant	2027	
B3-C	Anna Bryan	2028	1
R4-C	Apolo Madrigal	2028	7

11. Adjournment. Next meeting will be April 8, 2025, at our usual meeting room at Alexandria's GradLabs building, third floor Terranova Room, 9880 Campus Point Drive, and on Zoom.