UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes Virtual Meeting Via Zoom 6:00 P.M. August 10, 2021

Directors present, directors absent:

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavnaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Meagan Beale (MB), Neil Ramos (NR), Nancy Groves (NG), Caryl Lees Witte (CW), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), Ash Nasseri (AN), Rebecca Robinson (RR), Jon Arenz (JA), Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), Jason Moorhead (JM), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristie Miller (KM), Michael Leavenworth (ML), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Georgia Kayser (GK), Katie Witherspoon (KW-City of SD Planning), Andy Zhao (AZ-UCSD), Aidan Lin (AL-UCSD)

- 1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen 6:13pm. (Delay from Zoom bomb)
- 2. Agenda: Approved Adoption by Acclamation
- 3. Approval of Minutes from July 13, 2021.

CN-asked if there were any corrections?

AZ-moved to approve

ML – seconded

Motion to approve minutes --- 11 approved, 2 abstain

4. Announcements: Chair's Report: Chris Nielsen

- a. City Council wants non-profits to identify Creative Community San Diego (CCSD)
- b. Joe LaCava wants to strengthen the MHPA / MSCP
- c. David Castro from the Office of Performance and Analytics will be here next month
- d. Katie Witherspoon next month will report on UC Plan Update Subcommittee
- e. UC Plan Update Subcommittee meeting start time changed to 6:30 on Sept 21, by zoom
- f. Reported on UCPG subcommittee on traffic calming on Governor Drive on July 26.

5. Presentations:

a. Councilmember Joe LaCava –Kaitlyn Willoughby reported:

1. Legislative recess for this month but this gives district representatives time to talk to the constituents about their concerns and what to add to the City Council docket.

- 2. La Cava will hold Town Halls on Water and Sewer rates on August 18 at 6:00
- 3. District 1 Redistricting Town Hall for Community Input on August 11 at 5:30

4. Voted in favor of the City's Park Master Plan which hasn't been updated since 1956. Secured a commitment to have city staff prepare a comprehensive review of open space and is

working to secure an independent audit of the city's open space program.

5. New traffic assessment of Governor Drive when school starts and will meet with the community. No changes will be made until at least August 2022 since the project must be done in conjunction with a city sewer project along Governor (not Pure Water).

6. Stop sign at Agee St. will be installed, there is 30 days for comments from the community.

b. Planning Department—Katie Witherspoon

1. Park space and possible overlook park at the ends of Governor drive both S. & N.

2. UC Plan Update Subcommittee next meeting is Sept. 21, 6:30. NOTE START TIME CHANGE.

3. Planning Dept. has the Blueprint San Diego up on the web for review. Two workshops are coming up.

c. Governor Drive Traffic Subcommittee arranged by Chris Nielson: Two-hour meeting July 26 at 6:00 on zoom with John Lee Evans. Schools want to make safer arrangements for drop off and pick up of students and give students the opportunity to ride bikes to school. Chris arranged for Georgia Kayser from UCSD Urban Studies and Planning Department to give a short presentation on a "Road Diet" and will have another meeting once we have a new traffic study.

<u>Tom Heckman</u> asked where to find the UCPG minutes---under "planning boards" and agenda up only 24 hours ahead. Link is on SD city.gov site and includes both agenda and minutes.

<u>John Lee Evans</u>—commented that at the last meeting plans to change the sewer lines on Governor project will not take place until the new traffic study is done by traffic engineers.

<u>Mr. Haskett</u> ask if a traffic study was done before or during the past 18 months, or pre Covid. Need a new traffic study when school opens.

<u>Katie Witherspoon</u>—Clarification from the Plan Update. CP update since 2018 and Governor Drive was brought up as calming of traffic and mobility concept. Transportation and Storm Water knew about the possible Governor Dr. changes and city wants to make all the changes at the same time. Balancing parking, or a travel lane since the city is definitely going ahead with bike lanes, see mobility concepts at:

"https:://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2021.02-23-corudoc-concepts-wd-reduced.pdf"

<u>Paulette Williams</u> asked about CEQA guidelines which refer to wildfire and cumulative effects. KW explained the UCPU does not have draft EIR yet; these issues are to be mitigated. <u>Katie Witherspoon</u>'s address is <u>katiew@sandiego.gov</u> and the CEQA section of the Planning Dept. is <u>CEQA@sandiego.gov</u>.

d. CIP Projects----Roger Cavnaugh

1. CIP list which was approved last month by UCPG is in Word Doc; for a copy email Roger.

2. Vista La Jolla streetlights will go in place of the Lakewood and Governor traffic light (already funded; installation contract pending).

3. Deadline for CIP suggestions is Thurs. Aug 14. We have 10 projects but can add more suggestions.

4. For Bill Beck: the lights you requested for years are a go!

5. County also has a CIP list and can take our suggestions.

6. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items

a. Louis Rodolico—Is the city conflating "Open Space" and "Open Space Park"?

b. <u>AZ-</u> mobility concerns: Gilman bike lane was approved in 2001 but won't be completed until 2022. Meanwhile students at UCSD need a safe way to bike to campus.

c. <u>AZ</u>- housing concerns: Union Tribune reported that UCSD students are trying to get housing and over 3,000 or 30% of students will forgo food to pay rent here. Build more ADU's and housing.

d. <u>RRW</u>- referred to comment she made about her Gilman property at last month's meeting. Look at the zoning web site; look up by parcel. Also, 3200 students are on the wait list for housing.

7. Action Item: PTS 659148 Spectrum Bridge. Costal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, and Planned Development Permit to amend existing permits for new landscaping and a pedestrian bridge located at 3013,3033, 3035 Science Park Road and 3545 Cray Court. Steve Pomerenke, Alexandria Real Estate presenting: Planning a pedestrian/ bike bridge that will allow all One Alexandria Square buildings to connect by bridge, Cray Court to buildings on Science Park Road. First, they will remove all the invasive species from the canyon the bridge crosses, like Pampas Grass. The bridge will be 120 feet long and be a clear span, box bridge which is 10' wide. Signage will be added that describes what you see from the bridge. Bridge made of patina steel and connects without touching the canyon. Picture of bridge shown on slide.

<u>JS</u>-- Bridge looks good but how will you light it at night? How do you avoid trash being throw into the canyon?

<u>Pomerenke:</u> It will just have safety lighting that will not interfere with wildlife; look at the new UCSD pedestrian bridge on East campus. Both access points are from private property. There will be attention to keeping the canyon clear and keeping invasive plants out. And there will be security.

<u>AW</u>- Support the proposal and keep it open to other bike riders.

Tom Heckman- great design of the bridge.

Barry Bernstein – what about an EIR?

<u>Pomerenke</u>- There is a MND (Mitigated Negative Declaration) filed; the bridge is from development area to development area.

MOTION TO APPROVE: Made by AN, seconded by MB

VOTE: Yea---12, Nay-0, Absent-5, Recuse-1 (JM, employee of ARE)

8. Information Item: Smart Signalization on Genesee Avenue. Chris Clement, Alexandria Real Estate presenting. Alexandria Mobility Initiative for Greater University City. We realize that traffic is a problem and Alexandria wants to help solve some specific sections. At Campus Pt, Alexandria has a canyon, butterfly bowl next to the freeway, and is providing canyon restoration before additional buildings are added. Currently there is an 84-acre campus and 5,000 jobs and 2 million sq ft. of buildings. They are planning how to allow traffic to move from Campus Pt. Dr. while only having Genesee as an exit. There needs to be another exit from Campus Pt. Drive. Solutions: 1. Smart Signal Sync on Genesee to employ lights that keep traffic flowing. 2. Autonomous shuttle from the Voight trolley station to Alexandria. 3. Shuttle to Green Line in Sorento Valley. 4. Secondary access to Campus Pointe from Genesee between Scripps Health Offices and Qualcomm building. 5. To I-5 North, extend two more "storage lanes" from Qualcomm bldg., Scripps Office bldg. and Alexandria. Would need to make land available.

<u>CN</u> – how will this coordinate with proposed UCSD signals on La Jolla Village Drive? <u>Clement</u>—CalTrans, MTS, SANDAG, UCSD all have traffic coming back after Covid.

Alexandria as a good corporate citizen wants to help make the community better.

<u>ML</u> – Parking building at ground level to get directly to intersection with Genesee?

<u>Clement</u> – More of a life safety issue to make emergency exit available from the Alexandria site on Campus Point Drive.

<u>ATV</u> – Who would we (Scripps) work with?

<u>Clement</u> - Either myself or Steve Pomerenke.

<u>JS</u> – Smart Signal synchronized first?

<u>Clement</u> – Five or six years ago Lusk Blvd in Mira Mesa provided 24% improvement with 50% improvement potential. UCSD is also working on signals for safety for bikes and pedestrians.

JS - How far along Genesee would the signals extend? If it works, can it be expanded to SR 52?

<u>Clement</u> - Emergency signals are coordinated and get back into sync in about 30 seconds.

 \underline{AW} – Supportive comments and the CPU is where transportation is heading; all proactive and positive.

<u>J. Dosick</u> – Bike path down from Genesee to the coaster. E-bikes rather than cars. Bike path discussion followed.

<u>CN -</u>Good discussion: improving streets and traffic plans for bikes, pedestrians, and transit.

9. Action Item: Submitting CIP projects for the San Diego County CIP list. Items for this list are due on August 13th. Amanda Berry, Supervisor Lawson-Remer's office, presenting.

Usually, the county has concentrated on the unincorporated areas. District 3 has not received funding. County land packs, libraries, lack of county owned land . Capital budget funds can be used to purchase land so now for a new approach to do a cooperative list.

<u>CN</u> - not a lot of county land in UC but "Costal Rail Trail" (up Gilman and connect to UCSD) are things county could also submit even where they are joint partners. University City and La Jolla planning areas could get county to improve areas even five miles away but benefit from the totality of the project. How may we interact with the county and start work with that?

<u>Amanda Berry</u>- submit CIP projects and ideas. August 13 is the deadline to get ideas, not the deadline to submit CIP project.

10. Information Item: Housing bills active in the California Legislature. Christopher Vallejo, Senate Pro Tempore Atkins's office presenting. California has a housing crisis across the entire state. Currently building 80,000 per year but need 100,000 more per year. Of 108,000 built, only 64,000 were affordable housing.

SB 5- affordable rental and ownership for 6.5 million.

SB 7- (Signed by Gov.) provides streamlined CEQA processing.

SB 8- Housing Crisis Act limits fees for replacement until 2030 when they must be replaced.

SB 290 Clarifies density bonus density for lower income buildings. Student housing can benefit.

SB 330 –Allows underused buildings to be converted to housing by Community College Districts.

SB 477 – Housing and data collection expansion to insure we are getting valid results.

SB 791 – Technical assistance with state law provisions to help agencies build and plan to build on surplus land.

SB 478 – Allows construction of 3-10 units on land already zoned for multiple units, elevates allowable floor area ratio.

SB 9 – Allows 4 units on 1 lot but protects historical districts, height and set back limits and spurs production of ADU's or duplexes and rental space. In San Diego this could produce 54,000 spaces if ADU's were added in every eligible lot. With lot splits there could be no more than 4 units. Control is up to each city.

SB 10 up zone areas to 10 units without CEQA approval near transit center by streamlining CEQA and skip completely if less than 10 units in transit rich area or urban infill. San Diego is doing well. The bill allows but does not require cities to use its provisions.

<u>CN-</u> City has made a mess of this already in the ADU policy.

 \underline{JS} – Senate, assembly good but how laws are rolled out will make single family homes nonexistent. I have grave reservations on how the state can now say our deed restrictions no longer exist. **SB 670** voids lots of homeowner covenants and amendments and HOA rights and dues and the Davis Sterling Act and how it applies.

Vallejo – SB9 does not touch HOA's

<u>Bill Beck</u> – ADU's – city residents are concerned; the city and the state need to get together and still protect our properties. The city of San Diego goes well beyond the state rules on setbacks, and height limits. The city goes beyond the state provisions.

<u>Kittashett</u> – under SB 9 the lot size is minimal only 1200 feet. 40/60 split and set back 4 ft. decoupled from parking. How does this go with our water shortage?

<u>Vallejo</u> – infrastructure must be addressed also.

<u>Haskett</u> – This does not create cheaper housing.

<u>Bill Beck</u> – Attended Atkins meeting and this is not going to solve the problem and it is not sitting well with residents.

<u>Vallejo</u> – the owner must occupy at least one of the units.

<u>NG</u> – How does this make "affordable" housing?

<u>Vallejo</u> -ADU – is less than 800 sq. ft. ADU deed restricts adding more housing within city and no advantage of making it more affordable.

<u>AZ</u> – The Berkeley study looks at current shortfall. San Diego needs 108,000 over 8 years. The Terner report provisions of the bill could provide 700,000 new homes to be built. In California 554,000 total new homes are needed and SB9 makes 54,000 available using lot splits. 97% of single-family homes would do nothing for development opportunities.

<u>Barbara Gellman</u>- Developers and investors make out like bandits but this is not a solution to neighborhoods. Sacramento needs to reassess what neighborhoods want.

<u>Debbie Knight</u> – The flaw in all this is that real estate investment market has taken over houses. An example of this is how many homes have now been bought up as Air B&B's and in doing so buying housing stock and distorting the housing market. The state should take on the industry.

<u>Tom Heckman</u>- Tony Atkins needs to know that many of us look at our house as our retirement so that we don't become dependent on the state; we have a fixed income.

<u>Cole Reed</u>—Added the web site for housing bills --- <u>https://focus.senate.ca.gov/housing</u> <u>Vallejo</u> added his address---Christopher.Vallejo@CA.gov

11. Action Item: Council Redistricting. Does UCPG want to take a position on Redistricting, ad how should this be done? Should UCPG form a subcommittee to monitor this process through to completion?

CN: We need a motion concerning what would we like to see District 1 be like after redistricting: 1. Keep University Plan area together. 2. Keep plan area in District 1. 3. Keep District 1 as it is.

Discussion:

 \underline{JS} – Suggest 1 and 2 be combined as 1.

 \underline{DK} – During the 2011 redistricting people carved up the city in many different ways. There will be a tight time framework with which to work since the census data comes in late this year. It would be extremely difficult if they separate UCSD and the University City areas. We should move quickly and send it in now.

 \underline{AZ} – How tight are north and south UC; they seem very different and most people here are from south U.C.

MB - I like keeping the three suggestions separate but add to 1 that if split we would have to talk to two different council members

<u>JM</u> – We really should propose our wishes after the census data arrives. We are making conclusions with no data. SANDAG gave population for 9 districts. District 1 roughly equal to districts 2 and 5 with small deficit in Mira Mesa. Again, we are making suggestions without data.

<u>RC-</u> SANDAG unbalanced by 3-4% and one needs to be over 10% to be redistricted. When we have the meeting, tell us what you want. If we have to loose something then loses should be up north, if needed. La Jolla has 32,500, University City 70,000 and Carmel Valley 36,005.

 \underline{JS} – There is no north UC bias Andy. The entire community has worked so hard on UC unity. We are strongly impacted by UCSD and the north-south tie is strong. South UC relies on north UC for retail.

<u>KW</u> Redistricting does not affect the university plan district for UCPG. Some other plan areas are split with two districts.

<u>Debbie Knight</u> – Thanks Chris for discussing this and this is not our last time to discuss but the plan should go forward. We do have enough data to act.

<u>T. Haskett</u> – What are the negatives or disadvantages? Council boundaries are different from community planning group areas.

 \underline{CN} – Call the question.

MOTION TO APPROVE the three-point analysis. by JS and seconded by RC VOTE: yeas-7, nays- 2 (JM, AZ), abstain- 2 (ATV, JA)

CN will submit a letter to the redistricting committee tomorrow night based on the points listed and discussed. See letter below.

12. Information Item: Eventual in-person meetings. Chris Nielsen presenting.

We run out of options on September30. We expect the state to extend the deadline but if they don't extend, we may not meet in October. Jason says that Alexandria would host but it all depends on the Delta variant.

NEXT MEETING: Sept 14 by zoom.

Minutes submitted by Nancy Groves

Letter to the Redistricting Commission submitted by CN

August 10, 2021

San Diego City Redistricting Commission 202 C Street San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Redistricting Commissioners,

The University Community Planning Group at its meeting on August 10, 2021, approved the following motion regarding the Commission's redrawing of new Council District One boundaries:

1. Keep the University Community Plan area together

- a. We have been a Community Plan area with the same boundaries for over 30 years.
- b. The areas of the Community Plan area north and south of Rose Canyon are closely integrated. Many people who work at UC San Diego and attend school there live in University City south of Rose Canyon - in fact it is called University City because it was developed starting in the 1960s to build housing for the professors and staff at UC San Diego. Planning for University City and UC San Diego have been integrated for over 50 years.
- c. University City High School and the three elementary schools serve our community plan area. (University City High School; Standley Middle School; Doyle, Curie and Spreckels Elementary).

2. Keep the University Community Plan area in District 1.

- a. We are a contiguous area integrated by major roadways and shared open space resources, including residential, employment, commercial, common public schools, hospitals, parks and open space, and our relationship to UC San Diego.
- b. We are closely aligned with the coast and its institutions, and share them with La Jolla, including UC San Diego, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, the

Salk Institute, and Scripps Research Institute. We also share major hospitals at UC San Diego and Scripps, as well as parks and recreation, including the Glider Port and Torrey Pines State Reserve.

3. Keep District 1 the same if possible.

Sincerely,

Che

Chris Nielsen UCPG Chair